H.C. Usher
c.1

Boston University
College of Liberal Arts
Library

THE GIFT OF The Author

A.M. 1930
u
c.1

June 1930

p6544

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

THESIS

THE JESUS-PAUL CONTROVERSY

Submitted by

Harry Cedric Usher

(B.Sc., Melbourne, Australia, 1923)

In partial fulfilment of requirements for

the degree of Master of Arts

1930

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

p6544

378.744
BO
A.M. 1930
u
c.1

Outline.

	page.
The Jesus-Paul Controversy.	1-83.
1. Introduction- the problem stated.	1.
2. What is Christianity?	2-5.
3. Historical Review of the Controversy.	6-16.
A Discussion of the Bibliography.	9-16.
4. Sources of Our Knowledge.	17-28.
A. The Sources of the Life and Teachings of Jesus.	17-22.
B. The Primitive Church.	22-23.
C. Sources of the Life and Work of Paul.	23-28.
5. Jesus.	29-38.
A. His Religion.	30-34.
B. His Message.	34-38.
i. The Fatherhood of God.	34-35.
ii. The Kingdom of God.	35-36.
iii. Baptism.	36-37.
iv. The Lord's Supper.	37.
v. The Church.	37-38.
6. The Primitive Christian Religion in its Relation to Jesus and Paul.	39-46.
7. Paul.	47-67.
A. Personal Religion.	48-53.
B. Ethics.	53-57.
C. Kingdom of God.	58-60.
D. Doctrine of God.	60-61.
E. Knowledge of the Historical Jesus.	61-63.
F. Doctrine of the Church.	64.
G. Sacraments.	64-67.

Outline(contd.).

	page.
8. Jesus and Paul.	68-81.
A. Divergences.	69-74.
i. In Experience.	69-72.
ii. Teachings and the Law.	72-73.
iii. Christology and Redemption.	73-74.
B. Correspondences.	74-76.
i. Conception of God.	75-76.
ii. Ethics.	76.
C. Who was the Founder of Christianity?	76-81.
Summary.	82-83.
Bibliography.	84-89.

The Jesus-Paul Controversy.

I. Introduction - the problem stated.

The Jesus-Paul controversy concerns itself with the question as to whether Jesus or Paul was the founder of Christianity. To the ordinary layman the existence of such a matter of dispute would occasion surprise, to say the least, should he become cognizant of its existence, as the great majority of Christian people accept without demur the traditional idea that Jesus was the founder. In a measure there has always been a dispute over the matter. The primary object of concern in this thesis is to portray the modern form of the dispute. It has engaged the attention of scholars for some decades, and is by no means dead and buried at the present time. Skirmishes on the theological battle-ground have covered a wide territory. It is not a matter of purely academic concern, as theologians do exert an influence on religious beliefs, and it is part of their function to guard the heritage transmitted to them from heretical attacks and present it inviolate to their successors. It is difficult to conceive of a subject which gathers up into itself the major issues of religious dispute in our generation more adequately than does this particular controversy. Its ramifications are endless. Schweitzer has indicated how diverse and intricate are the paths that present themselves in the quest of the historical Jesus. The Jesus-Paul controversy concerns itself with all the major problems of dispute in the lives and teachings of both Jesus and Paul. It is approached from the religious, the literary, historical, and other points of view. An endeavor will be made to show what an enormous divergence of opinion prevails among writers on the subject.

2. What is Christianity?

Obviously enough, one of the first questions that presents itself has to do with the essential nature of Christianity.

> Proceeding from a discussion of the mystery-religions in their relation to Pauline thought Peabody goes on to say - "such, according to many modern scholars was the transformation of the simplicity of a Galilean gospel into the subtleties and sacraments which surround a saviour-god. 'The whole conception of Christian worship was changed. But it was changed by the influence upon Christian worship of the contemporary worship of the mysteries and the concurrent cults.' Does not this conclusion, if it be accepted, fortify the view that the Apostle Paul was the founder of Christianity? If, as Loisy summarizes the results of his inquiry, the mysteries 'enlarged the idea of God,' the 'idea of Christ', and 'the idea of salvation'; if the simple story of the gospels was expanded by Paul into a fulfilment of those religious dreams which had hovered before the Roman world, then it must not only be admitted that the transition represents one of the most strategic and revolutionary adventures in the history of thought, but also that the great figure in the new movement is not Jesus, but Paul.
>
> "Yet the more one is led to emphasize these aspects of the teaching of Paul, the more difficult is the dilemma in which Pauline Christianity thus becomes involved. For the cosmic drama thus conceived, with its descending God and redemptive sacrifice, - this which has become the corner-stone of many schemes of salvation which Christian theologians have built, - if it be derived from these alien cults, must be regarded as essentially a non-Christian, or at least as a composite creation, appropriating so much from extra-Christian sources that, as has been lately affirmed by an Anglican scholar, 'There were gradually imported (into the conduct of baptism, the eucharist, etc.) many ideas which were almost absent from these institutions in their primitive Jewish-Christian form.' In other words, many elements of Pauline teaching which have been often regarded as fundamental would become, if traced to this origin, brilliant adaptations from Oriental mythology, and the theologian who accepts them as of the essence of Christianity would in reality be abandoning the discipleship of Jesus for a revival of pagan mysticism.
>
> "It is a curious Nemesis which might thus issue from the subordination of the simple narratives of the Gospels to the daring speculations of the great apostle. What was welcomed as a reenforcement of orthodox belief might turn out to be not even Christian in origin, and the religion of Jesus might be displaced by the pagan tradition of a saviour-god. A surprising end might thus be reached through acceptance of the Pauline mystery as the bulwark of conservative theology; and the drastic comment of Martineau might be even more justified

> to-day than when that great and devout scholar made it thirty years ago: 'Christianity, as defined or understood in all the Churches which formulate it, has been mainly evolved from what is transient and perishable in its sources: from what is unhistorical in its traditions, mythological in its preconceptions, and misapprehended in the oracles of its prophets.'
>
> "At this point, then, the problem presented by the teaching of Paul becomes more completely defined. On the one hand there confronts the inquirer a transition from the simplicity of the Gospels to the complexity of another world of thought and experience; but on the other hand there is a not less tenacious grasp of the spirit of the Gospels, which lifts the finest utterances of Paul to the level of those of Jesus himself. On the one hand is a bold restatement of Christian origins in the language of Oriental mysteries; while on the other hand, shining through these non-Christian forms of speech, is a personality after the mind of Christ, untiring in devotion, passionate for righteousness, and offering on his own part what he asks of others,'a living sacrifice, consecrated and acceptable to God.' Thus, as Harnack has said, 'Those who blame him (Paul) for corrupting the Christian religion have never felt a single breath of his spirit, and judge him only by mere externals;.... those who extol or criticise him as a founder of religion are forced to make him bear witness against himself on the main point, and acknowledge that the consciousness which bore him up and steeled him for his work was illusory and self-deceptive.'"(1).

This is far from being a positive definition of Christianity; it serves to indicate at the outset how we would have to conceive of Christianity by following certain lines of thought and to illustrate some of the complexities involved even in such a small and introductory matter as that of definitions.

Loisy says that Christ is inseparable from his work "and that the attempt to define the essence of Christianity according to the pure gospel of Jesus apart from tradition cannot succeed, for the mere idea of the gospel without tradition is in flagrant contradiction with the facts submitted to criticism."(2)

Harnack thinks that we are to look for the materials of the Christian religion in Jesus Christ and his gospel, but not

---

(1). Peabody,F.G.:"The Apostle Paul and the Modern World", pp3-5
(2). Loisy,A.:"The Gospel and the Church", p15.

in this alone. A complete answer is impossible unless we take into account the effects he produced upon his followers. In his opinion a right estimate must take its stand upon a comprehensive induction that covers all the facts of its history.

"In the final analysis, Christianity is a personal attitude toward God and man - a way of living that finds its present inspiration, as well as its historical illustration, in the personality, spirit, and teachings of Jesus."(1).

> "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.' (I Cor. 3:11). That this categorical statement should have been made within at most a generation of the death of Christ, constitutes a fact which must needs challenge attention. The view here expressed by the apostle embodies in effect what has been the undeviating persuasion of Christendom as a whole: the note he strikes is that which rings unmistakably through all the Christian centuries. When we say that Christianity is the religion of Christ, we mean that it is the religion which centers in his Person; the Founder is Himself the Foundation. He is not merely the exponent of a faith, but its object."(2). "Christianity is that religion which has Christ himself for its center and dynamic, and apart from his personality would be as dead as the body apart from the spirit."(3).

Similar testimonies could be multiplied indefinitely. There is not a word here about Christianity as a religion founded by Paul: on the contrary he is cited as one of the greatest authorities in support of the primacy of Jesus. It would be a comparatively easy task to demonstrate that the apostle Paul is indeed the finest exponent and living embodiment of this conception of the Christian religion. It might be urged that these are merely traditional conceptions which need to be revised in the light of modern knowledge. But they are made or advanced by reputable modern scholars. Which serves to illustrate the point already made - that the

---

(1). Kent,C.F.:"The Life and Teachings of Jesus." p1.
(2). Warschauer,J.: "Jesus: Seven Questions", p 3.
(3). Ibid., p 16.

controversy under discussion is confined to the theologians, and is entirely at variance with the overwhelmingly united experience of the Christian Church.

We have seen that the main issue of the controversy centers around the person of the founder, and that it is bound up with the alternative Jesus or Paul. Some representative expressions have been cited to indicate exactly what is meant by Christianity. It is a questionable method to depend upon hard and fast definitions. Nevertheless all great religions have had a historic beginning and a historic founder. A misinterpretation of the true nature of Christianity at once makes possible a divergence of view as to who the founder really was. We can either prefer to regard Christianity as a way of life and a spirit that inspires to action, or as an organization of creeds and ritual. It is because Christianity seems to be so little of the former and so much of the latter that many have preferred to regard Paul rather than Jesus as the founder. It is not, however, solely a matter of alternatives. In reality historic Christianity embraces both of these aspects. The central abiding power and dynamic finds its perpetual source in Jesus Christ - to dispense with which is to deprive Christianity of its right to such a title. The matter of organization and creeds is flexible and should be adapted to meet changing needs. However, in the opinions which have been cited there is a general consensus which indicates that Christianity depends upon Jesus Christ as its founder in the sense of a historic beginning and also as the source of the power for its expansion and many-sided development in the succeeding centuries. It is now time to review the subject with special reference to the modern development it has had.

3. Historical Review of the Controversy.

Scholars have approached the matter from many angles. It is difficult to believe that they are successful in their attempts to apply the literary historico-critical methods, as their findings always seem to have a touch of the subjective about them. This is doubtless a permanent defect of the method itself. It does appear to be true that many of them start with preconceptions and read these into the same subject matter. It needs but a little common sense to see that two extremely contradictory conclusions cannot be true of the same fact. The last century saw a remarkable growth of interest in the study of New Testament literature. All phases of the life and work of Jesus came up for review. The alternative was placed before the religious world of a belief in the "Jesus of history" or "the Christ of faith". Later, attention was directed to the difference between the portrait of Jesus in the gospels and that presented in the Pauline epistles and in the Johannine literature. The historicity of the latter had long been under suspicion. Thus arose a new alternative - the assertion on the one hand that Jesus, and on the other that Paul, was the Founder of Christianity. It is possible, as in so many other cases, that in these two instances the ultimate solution is not "either, or", but "both-and". No longer were the traditional conceptions of the Church acceptable. Men began to think that they had been under the domination of Pauline theology too long, and it was time to get back of Paul to the pristine truth embodied in Jesus. Schweitzer points out that many of the writers in the life of Jesus research have demonstrated a strong hatred in their work. He qualifies this by saying that their hatred is not so much toward the person

of Jesus, or even at all towards him personally, but rather towards the traditional dogma and incrustations of theology which hide his true personality from men. Probably in no other instance is their hatred so strongly manifest as in the allusion they make to the apostle Paul. His Corinthian traducers have had a modern resurrection. It is a matter for rejoicing that there are still those who can take up the cudgels on behalf of the doughty apostle. It is to be regretted, (assuming it to be true), that Truth should assume so many illusive forms that men become lost in a pursuit of her through the labyrinthine ways of their own thought.

Many historians seem to give Paul all the credit for our modern theological system. Some of them allude to Augustine and Luther, but fail to give these men their portion of the blame, (if such it may be called), for what is in reality an unavoidable historical phenomenon. Whatever else Paul may or may not have done, he must be given credit for piloting the cause of the Church through the first major crisis that threatened it, namely, the danger of becoming incased in the traditional forms of Judaism. With Augustine, Paulinism enjoyed a new lease of life, due in part to the striking resemblance in the personal experiences of the two men. Some historians think that Augustine was greater than Paul, and that he has exerted a more far-reaching influence upon modern thought. He undoubtedly influenced the thought of the Western Church for one thousand years after his own time.

The next major eruption of Paulinism had its genesis in the experience of Luther. He endeavored to throw off the strangle-hold of Catholicism in the realm of ecclesiastical authority by reverting to the truth as it was in the New

Testament. Unfortunately he stopped with Paul. The epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians sounded the call to arms and blazoned forth the dawn of a new day for the Christian liberty of the individual man. The reformers, including Calvin, have unquestionably cast the theological thought of Protestant denominationalism in Pauline moulds. But why blame Paul for that? He would doubtless have been the first to oppose such a tendency. The historical fact is clear that these men, including Paul, were victims of the shortcomings of human nature. Called to lead movements of thought at crucial stages in the history of the Church, they were sufficiently robust intellectually to bestride the situation and to ride the storm. Of necessity, they were hurried beyond their original plans and purposes and forced to extremes in instances which both they and we regret. But it is due primarily to the grasshopper-like stature of their successors that we have been dragooned into the present dilemma of theological thought. The basic principles were always there, and will suffice to enable the modern Church to meet the situation.

It is possible to distinguish a Catholic-Protestant skirmish, the theologians on either side taking Paul as an authority for individual liberty or for sacramental authority. What a strange commentary that Protestantism claims Augustine as one of its saints, and that both Augustine and Luther were disciples of Paul as well as of Jesus! It is stranger still to find that these biased theologians claim that they are employing the scientific-historical method with equal veracity.

Still again, we find even within Protestantism the opposing camps of liberals and conservatives, Fundamentalists and Modernists, arranging themselves into schools of thought.

Analyzing it in still greater detail, there emerges the rival schools of thought of Messianism and Eschatology as governing principles in the lives of both Jesus and Paul. It is impossible to forecast what new problems may arise in the future. But probably the study of comparative religions must receive the palm for the diversity of conclusions that can be reached from the same data. One is almost tempted to lose patience with the whole attempt of such men when their wild hypotheses as to the origin of Christianity and its sacraments are found to be based upon such unsubstantial premises.

A discussion of the bibliography.

It may not be amiss to append here a brief discussion of the bibliography of the subject. Needless to say this is voluminous, and only a small fragment of it has been surveyed. The main outlines are common to all writers, and these will be taken up in due course. A great deal of attention is given by authors to the theology of Paul and the teachings of Jesus. Many of the questions singled out are, however, somewhat irrelevant. Some writers devote an entire book to the consideration of a single phase either of Pauline theology or of the teachings of Jesus. The development of the primitive Christian Church and its relation to both Jesus and Paul receives its meed of attention. Of late, increasing interest is being taken in the study of comparative religions and the influence of other religions than Judaism upon the new faith. It is possible to find the thin line of Truth running through much faulty exegesis and personal animosity.

The discussion of the relationship of the teaching of Paul and Jesus goes back at least as far as Bauer's article in 1828.* It has received increasing vigor in the present century.

* Schweitzer on p.120 of "Paul and His Interpreters" gives 1850.

The issues are of no small importance to the Christian Church, and this has given unusual keenness to the controversy. It is plainly an attempt to dissociate historical Christianity from Jesus of Nazareth and to lay the responsibility for the transformation upon Paul. To one school Paul is an indispensable support for the traditional construction of Christian theology - to another he is an unauthorized intruder whose thought and influence must be eliminated before we can secure a just view of Jesus and a true appreciation of his religion.

Among the influences at work in the modern phase of the controversy may be reckoned the philosophical approach. Schools of philosophy influenced the founders of schools of historical criticism. Ferdinand Christian Baur, for example, applied the Hegelian dialectic by postulating as a thesis the Petrine idea of the Church, as an antithesis the Pauline notion, and finishing with the Catholic Church as a synthesis. His radical ideas have been in a measure discarded, and the prevailing mode is to apply the evolution theory to a solution of the problem.

The quotations which follow are arranged in the order of their emergence from the press. They do not represent any particular development, nor are they designed to be normative for their authors. They do indicate a divergence of opinion and will serve to throw into relief some of the points at issue.

"But even the judgment, that the ideas of Paul and James or any other New Testament writer are of standard authority for Christian doctrine, must in the last instance be justified by indicating their agreement with the teaching of Jesus. So far as it may be found opposed to this teaching, the authority of Paul must yield to the higher of Jesus Christ, whose servant and apostle he was."(I).

(I). Wendt,H.H.: The Teachings of Jesus", Vol I, p 5.

"It is not to be put to his credit that he emancipated Christianity from Judaism. To have separated it from what is best in the Jewish religion and ethics would have been to render it a great disservice. That he liberated it from bondage to externalities and formalism and gave it to mankind not only as a doctrine, but also as a power of the spirit and as an ethical life, is his indefeasible merit."(I). Such is Cone's estimate of the contribution of Paul.

The controversy assumed added momentum in the present century by the appearance of the radical views of Wrede. This was followed by a whole avalanche of refutations which were more or less satisfactory. Wrede seems to have achieved a prominent position as a radical both in his study of Jesus and of Paul. Schweitzer says that Wrede's little book belongs to the literature of the world because of its excellent style. It appears to have taken the theological world by storm. According to this writer the religion of Paul is theological through and through - his religion is his theology. Wrede thinks that from the Christological standpoint Jesus was a Son of God conceived metaphysically, as a supernuman, a divine figure whose origin lies in God. According to Wrede the humanity of Christ is an impalpable phantom. "In comparison with Jesus Paul is essentially a new phenomenon; as new considering the large basis of common ground as he could possibly be."(2). Wrede summarizes Paul's importance for the history of the world under the following heads,

i, he transplanted Christianity as a world religion,

ii, he divorced himself and the new religion from Judaism,

iii, he was the creator of the Christian theology.

(I). Cone,O.: "Paul the Man", p vii.
(2). Wrede,W.:"Paul", p 165.

Arnold Meyer crystallizes the problem by declaring that the cardinal aim of Jesus was to call men into repentance and heartfelt communion with God as their Father, and not that they should regard him (Jesus), as the Messiah. From such a basis he opines that the first thing to do is to try by purely historical investigation to ascertain what our Lord and what Paul really performed, and in what relation they stood to one another.(I).

"Paulinism is an integral part of the history of dogma; for the history of dogma begins immediately upon the death of Jesus."(2). Schweitzer thinks that it is a primary task in the history of dogma to define the position of Paul in relation to the Hellenizing of the gospel. Schweitzer sums up the two great problems as to what Paul's doctrine had in common with primitive Christianity and what in common with the Greek idea. With the latter, according to this writer, it must be granted that a common basis is found in religious terminology, but nothing in respect to ideas. "Paul did not Hellenise Christianity. His conceptions are equally distinct from those of Greek philosophy, and from those of the Mystery Religions."(3). "In its essence Paulinism can be nothing else than an eschatological mysticism, expressing itself with the aid of the Greek religious terminology."(4). "The only kind of interpretation which can be considered historical is one which makes it clear how a man who believed in the death and resurrection of Jesus and his imminent Parousia, was, in virtue of that belief, in a position to understand the thoughts of the apostle to the Gentiles and to follow his arguments, and was logically obliged to accept them."(5).

(I). "Jesus or Paul?" 1909.
(2). Schweitzer,A.:"Paul and His Interpreters", pvi. (3). Ibid., p 298. (4). Ibid., p 241. (5). Ibid., p 248.

McNeile is of opinion that the answer to the question of the nature of Christianity is not fully given when we have said that it represents either the teachings and doings of Jesus or the doctrine of the New Testament writers or of creeds. This writer thinks we should include both what Jesus said and did and what he was and is still being realized to be.

> "We study then his teaching, claims, character, life, not as the elementary beginnings of a system of thought which is called Christianity, but as the fundamental and permanent basis on which a Christianity could be reared, an undying seed which could grow and is still growing."(1). "The Christianity of today is, broadly speaking, the Christianity of Saint Paul. The extent to which this is so is the measure of the apostle's greatness. The value of a man's life-work is always to be gauged by its abiding effect upon others. But when this test is applied to him and to Jesus Christ, there is discovered an essential difference between them. The effects of the apostle's life are the effects of his teaching reenforced by his character - those of the Lord's life are wrought by the imparting of His character through his permanent spiritual presence reenforced by his teaching. Christianity is Christ - the Christian body is the growing expression of himself, and no other human being has ever borne or can ever bear, the same relation to any movement, organization, or society. And it was because Saint Paul was the principal exponent of this truth that his work holds the first place in the apostolic presentation of our religion."(2). "Does the Christian religion, with its organization the Church, come to us from Jesus Christ, or must it be traced to a different and later origin in the mind of Saint Paul? Did Paul overshadow Jesus, so that the religion of the prophet of Nazareth largely faded out of sight? Was the religion of Jesus the earlier writing of a palimpsest which has been saved from obliteration in recent years by the skill of criticism and the discovery of which renders the later Pauline subject matter comparatively worthless?"(3).

Peabody supplies us with an extraordinary contrast between Jesus and Paul of which the following is a fair sample-

> "No sooner, however, does one reach this sense of confidence in the teaching of Jesus than he is confronted with a new and perplexing problem. As he passes from the synoptic Gospels to the letters of Paul, he becomes aware of another climate of thought

(1). McNeile,A.H.: "N.T.Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's",p xiv. (2). Ibid., p vii. (3). Ibid., p 78.

> and hears another language of counsel and instruction. The teaching of Jesus was persuasive, suggestive, illuminating; the teaching of Paul was didactic, hortatory, polemical. Jesus was a seer; Paul was an advocate. Jesus synthesized life; Paul analyzed it. The teaching of Jesus had the quality of timelessness; Paul was a man of his own time, facing its issues and involved in its controversies. The thought of Jesus habitually moved above the level of contentious aims; the thought of Paul wrestled with the problems of his age and race. Jesus was a child of the countryside. In teaching and habit, he lived close to nature. The grain and the harvest, the fig-tree and the fruit, the birds in their flight, the hen and her chickens, the signs of the weather, the sparrows and the sheep, the mountain and the lilies, - all these aspects of the world about him spoke to him of his Father's kingdom. In his need of intimate communion with the Father, 'he went up the hill by himself to pray', and 'when evening came he was there alone.' In the letters of Paul, on the other hand, one finds hardly an allusion to these homely aspects of nature. The distant thunderings of cosmic tragedies are heard, and the groaning and travailing of creation; but the field, the lake and the fishes have no place in his picture of the world."(1).

"Paul was a thinker too great, too vivid, too human, to be systematic. A system of Pauline thought will always be wrong somewhere; what the student of Paul has to do is to realize by experience, somehow, what that love of Christ, revealed in the Cross, and far above all law (for it transforms law into instinct), meant to Paul. Otherwise do not let him give the name of Paul to what he draws."(2).

"Christianity has a unique advantage over all its competitors, including even Judaism, in having an historic person as Founder whose Person was greater than his teachings."(3)

Bacon expresses the situation somewhat succintly. He says that many deplore the theological disputes for which they hold Paul largely responsible, and seek a practical way out by falling back on the ethics of Jesus.

---

(1). Peabody,F.G.:"The Apostle Paul and the Modern World",p5-6.
(2). Glover,T.R.:"Paul of Tarsus", p90.
(3). Angus,S.:"St. Paul and the Mystery Religions", p309.

> "Paul's interpretation of the significance of his career and fate has become distasteful to moderns in consequence of the repeated attempts of theologians from Augustine down, contrary to the emphatic protest of Paul himself, to make Paul's particular interpretations obligatory on all. 'I am of Paul' is their cry, and they would impose Paul's interpretation upon all, unchanged save as they themselves have unconsciously changed it, having never learned to know Paul the peacemaker, the champion of toleration and liberty. Paul's interpretation of Christ has become utterly distasteful because of this un-Pauline intolerance of change, and many, because of what they wrongly take to be Pauline, are ready to abandon his truly impregnable and eternal 'witness of the spirit' for defenses hastily thrown up by various schools of criticism around what they regard as 'central verities'. Our 'solid rock' is to appear, firm and unchangeable, when they have accomplished their quest for the Mind of Jesus expressed in his living words and in his speaking life."(1).

"A Pauline doctrine may be separated into a number of component parts, Jewish and Hellenistic, and it might appear that after this analysis there is nothing left. But surely there is Paul. Into all that he borrows he has put himself; his own mind and faith and experience, and it is this addition which matters. The criticism which leaves it out of sight has missed the whole meaning of the doctrine."(2).

"In the historical expressions of the Christian faith, in the essence of Christian experience, the influence of Paul and John has been far greater than that of Jesus."(3).

In his contribution toward the understanding of Paul Dr. Bratton thinks that the puzzle is to be solved by the recognition of the transformation of early Christianity in the latter half of the first century from the simple gospel of Jesus to a Graeco-Jewish doctrinal system, a transition in which the apostle had no little part. He contends that Pauline Christology cannot be reconciled with the self-consciousness of Jesus. Paul's apologetic, according to this writer, framed by the very nature of circumstances a gospel about Jesus rather than a gospel of

---

(1). Bacon,B.W.:"The Story of Jesus andthe Beginnings of the Church", p/. (3). Bundy,W.E.:"Our Recovery of Jesus",pI. (2).Case,S.J.:"Studies in Early Christianity", p 8.

Jesus. In his opinion there is a continuity between them in religious values and ethical principles, and there are divergences in Soteriology, Christology, and sacramentalism. In other words, he thinks we can detect an agreement in the apostle's religious experience of Jesus, and a divergence in his theological explanation of Christ's person. According to this writer it is the message and not the method which is important for us, and our task to-day is to distinguish between his religion and theology, between that which is permanent and that which is transitory. Dr. Bratton thinks that Paul's experience of Christ belongs to all the centuries and that his significance is to be found in his loyalty to the Master for whom he gave his life. (I).

The major problems have been stated, but the controversy is by no means at an end. It is too much to expect that there will be ultimate unity of opinion on this or on any other point. It is possible, however, for the student to find a measure of unity and harmony throughout it all, and to realize that the welfare of the Church is assured if she continues to build on the truth as it is found in the gospels, and not in the writings of these radical critics and theologians, although it is unquestionable that they emphasise important aspects of truth from time to time.

(I). Bratton,F.:"Toward the Understanding of Paul", Christian Century, Oct., 1929.

4. The sources of our Knowledge.

A consideration of the sources of our knowledge is of the utmost importance. The records of the New Testament constitute the basic facts for all hypotheses concerning the true origin of Christianity. From the same relatively limited body of source material spring all manner of diverse interpretations. It is a commonplace to say that one can prove anything with facts. The danger becomes all the more subtle when it is seen how easily a preconceived bias may read itself into facts which really afford it no justification whatever.

A. The sources of the Life and Teachings of Jesus.

The best evidence for the traditional view that Jesus was the founder of Christianity is to be found in the record of his life and teachings as they are contained in the Synoptic gospels, and particularly in the gospel of Mark and the reconstructed source "Q" of the sayings found in Matthew and Luke. This represents the essentially practical outcome of the vast amount of research devoted to the subject in the last century. Most scholars now accept the fact of the historicity of Jesus. Some extremists have endeavored to prove that Jesus was a mere myth, a hypothetical savior-god, the object of worship by a Christ-cult. Their hypothetical constructions are unconvincing in the extreme. They endeavor to establish the fact that it does not matter whether or no we can prove the historicity of Jesus: we have the teachings and they are sufficient. Such an assertion serves to throw into bold relief two significant aspects of the controversy. On the one hand it is maintained that we can prove the fact that Jesus actually existed, and that we can with a reasonable degree of assurance arrive at an accurate knowledge of what he did and said. But Christianity cannot be explained

merely as a religion with a historic founder. Many people consider it a mark of good fortune that Jesus did not commit his teachings to the written page. The mere possession of indubitable facts which have their roots in the past only makes the possibility of these eternal truths being encased in dogmas to which intellectual belief is demanded all the greater. On the other hand, to maintain the possibility of Christianity having attained its present superiority among world religions by the mere propagation of a myth is equally unsatisfactory. For those who are at all inclined to expound the view, there is manifested a pronounced tendency to date the gospels as late as possible in order to allow for the development of myths. They are not successful in this. The gospel of John is now considered to be of priceless religious value, but not as useful a source for the life and teachings of Jesus as are the other gospels. It is an interesting comparison to watch the growth of scientific certainty in relation to Biblical research with the development of science in any other field of modern enquiry.

Reference has already been made to the manifest difference in thought and treatment between the gospels and the Pauline epistles in relation to their conception of the work and person of Jesus. This at once raises the question as to whether the Synoptic picture of Christ can be reconciled with the exalted figure of Pauline thinking. To what extent do the claims of Paul for Christ compare with Jesus' thought of himself? Is it not possible that the Synoptic accounts are unreliable, that they are colored by exalted ideas of Paul already known to the Church? It is exceedingly doubtful that this tendency operated to any considerable extent.

Somerville thinks that Paul's thought in relation to the Messianic consciousness of Jesus is in fundamental agreement with that of Jesus, and that he is also in full agreement with the representation of the gospels when he apprehended Jesus as the embodied spirit of God. According to this writer Paul is not wrong even when he goes beyond the thought of Jesus for himself. The chief value of the gospels, in Somerville's opinion, consists in the light that they throw on the religious worth of the Christ of glory. "The emphasis placed by Paul on the Cross as the achievement of salvation is warranted by the importance attached by Christ himself to his death as an integral part of his mission to save men, and as the condition for the success of that mission."(I).

Bundy states that our knowledge of the historical Jesus is mediated through the primitive Christian community - a medium which by the very nature of its religious experience communicated its faith in him rather than the facts of his life. Bundy explains the differences between the Synoptics and John by saying that Paul comes between them in point of time, and that in John the deep and difficult thoughts of Paul speak to Christendom in a wonderfully simple form through the lips of Jesus himself. There are some writers who would make Paul a contributor to all the books of the New Testament. "If by Paulinism is meant a worldwide mission, and freedom from the Jewish law, in that case, and only then, Mark may be said to exhibit Pauline influence."(2).

Kent lists the sources of our knowledge of the life of Jesus as follows,

i, the evidence supplied by Christianity at

(I). Somerville,D.:"St! Paul's Conception of Christ", p294.
(2). Bundy,W.E.:"Our Recovery of Jesus", p106.

work in the world. This might be characterized as a pragmatic proof.

ii, the evidence of Roman historians. We have certain statements by Tacitus, Suetonius and Pliny which taken altogether afford flimsy references which would be valueless if considered alone.

iii, Jewish writers such as Josephus afford us but meager information.

iv, some evidence is to be found in the Roman catacombs.

v, the uncanonical gospels are listed.

vi, recently discovered sayings of Jesus are also included.

vii, the writings of the Church fathers.

viii, the apocryphal gospels.

ix, the Pauline epistles.

x, the books of Acts and Revelation.

xi, the value of the extra-gospel testimony.(I).

The most important of these sources, apart from the gospels, which have already been mentioned, is undoubtedly the Pauline epistles. Paul, however, tells us practically nothing of the person and the life of Jesus. Further attention will be devoted to this point later.

> Wendt adds his testimony as follows - "The sources of the actual teaching of Jesus do not lie merely in the gospel accounts, but also in the literature of the apostolic age, especially in the epistles of Paul. We have here to consider, not merely the various citations of sayings of Jesus outside the gospels, but rather the fact that the whole apostolic doctrine gives indirect testimony to the teaching of Jesus. The doctrine of the apostles, even that of Paul, though he did not become a disciple in the time of Jesus, was a product of the

(I). Kent,C.F.:"The Life and Teachings of Jesus", p111.

> mighty influence of the ministry of Jesus. Other factors have manifestly conspired to shape this product, and even to alter it, in the case both of Paul and the early apostles. Yet the apostles themselves, Paul included, had certainly no purpose of altering, but only of communicating the teaching of Jesus. Their proclamation of the Messianship of Jesus was, in their consciousness, no new doctrine, but only a continuation and carrying out of the Messianic claim of Jesus himself. Therefore, even had no direct accounts about Jesus been handed down to us, we should still possess, in the apostolic literature, a perfectly valid testimony to the historical existence and epoch-making significance of Jesus as a teacher. It would also be thoroughly justifiable if, in seeking the deepest basis for a critical examination of the historical trustworthiness of the gospel accounts, we took for that purpose the Pauline epistles, as being the oldest and most reliable parts of the apostolic literature. For from these epistles alone could be determined what was essentially and in substance the general views and teachings of Jesus; and by the result we could test the contents of the gospel accounts. Yet it would not be warrantable to apply this method, valid as it is in itself, where the object is to give a comprehensive account of the teaching of Jesus on the basis of a critical examination of the original sources. For, in comparison with the rich detailed information as to the teaching of Jesus yielded by the gospel accounts based on the original sources, the knowledge indirectly derivable from the Pauline epistles is much too general in character to form a suitable foundation for the arrangement and exposition of the whole material handed down through the gospels. It is only, therefore, in the way of regarding the apostolic doctrine as the historical result of the teaching of Jesus, and as bearing witness to the mighty influence of that teaching, that we can make use of those indirect sources for the purposes of this work."(I).

Bacon makes the following interesting comment - "To dispel the doubt of the age just past, it was an astonishing practical mistake on the part of the so-called 'liberal' leaders to abandon the position which had just received the most splendid vindication in the history of biblical criticism, I mean the historical authentication of the greater epistles of Paul, giving us first-hand information from one who personally knew Peter the apostle, and James the brother of Jesus, one who could and does say 'I received', 'I heard', 'I saw', to entrench themselves behind reports of the life and teachings of

(I). Wendt,H.H.:"The Teaching of Jesus", p 28ff.

Jesus, which, however precious as a secondary authority, could scarcely stand in court at all without the primary support of Paul."(I).

Despite the value of the Pauline testimony we must remain devoutly thankful that we have the gospel accounts, imperfect though they be. They were written in the first instance in answer to a felt need. The original disciples were passing away, and it was considered advisable to enshrine their testimony in written form. It does not seriously detract from their value that they were not written by the first disciples of Jesus. The very freedom they display in the main from theological interpretations is an added proof of their value. Without them we would know little or nothing of the work and teachings of Jesus; with them we may get very close to him and in imagination see and hear him speak as he did of old. Criticism has made a valuable contribution here in helping us to separate the minor excresences which had covered the original thought.

B. The Primitive Church.

This is an aspect of the subject which is not always given due prominence by contributors to the controversy. They tend to draw sharp antitheses between Jesus and Paul, rather than to trace a gradual evolution through the development in thought and deed of the early Church. Our source of information is very meager, and is contained in the early chapters of the book of Acts. The Pauline epistles, of course, enable us to form a fairly correct idea of the life and thought of the Pauline churches; but the book of Acts helps us to see that there were other currents moving which were not directly connected with Paul. The main difficulty with Acts as a source is that it is open to question whether it represents historical fact, or is

---

(I). Bacon,B.W.:"The Story of Jesus and the Beginnings of theCh." 15

a polemic written by a companion of Paul to smooth over certain issues of his ministry. There is quite a respectable body of opinion today behind the assertion that Luke was the author of Acts, and that in the main the work can be accepted as historical. On such grounds we are enabled to take up the thread of the Church from the time of the Resurrection of Jesus and carry it through in its larger issues to the imprisonment of Paul in Rome.

C. Sources of the Life and Work of Paul.

We finally come to a consideration of the sources of our knowledge of Pauline thought, and with it to the field of endless differences of opinion upon all issues of both major and minor importance. Tradition and common Christian acceptation ascribe thirteen of the New Testament books to the credit of the apostle to the Gentiles. There are still a few extremists who would contend for fourteen, but they exert no appreciable influence. It is obvious that we can arrive at a tremendous range of interpretation according to the amount of Pauline material which is admitted to be genuine and historical. It is hardly necessary to consider seriously the contention of some writers that Paul, as well as Jesus, was a myth. Such a contention is well outside the borders of critical scholarship. The authenticity of the Pauline epistles has undergone strange fluctuations at the hands of the critics. Baur decided to accept the four epistle of Romans, Galatians, first and second Corinthians as genuine, and to reject the rest as of non-Pauline origin. He thought that these four epistles were unlikely to be disputed. A Dutch school of hyper-critics, however, has gone to the extreme of rejecting all the Pauline material. Baur's position has long since been abandoned. The

present tendency is to accept the epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and first Thessalonians as on a par with the four basic letters already mentioned, while a certain amount of doubt still attaches to second Thessalonians and Ephesians. This may be said to represent the present extreme critical wing.

A considerable body of critical opinion, however, would accept all ten of these letters as genuinely Pauline. The remaining three, referred to as the Pastorals, are still in the balance. There is a more or less equal division of opinion as to their acceptance or rejection, and one would have very substantial opinion to support the contention that all of the thirteen letters may be regarded as the work of Paul, with more or less redaction in the case of the Pastorals.

It is at once obvious that we are precipitated into a hopeless quandary as far as any decisive or satisfactory elaboration of Pauline thought is concerned while this present uncertainty reigns. Contributors to the controversy are careful to define their position on this issue, as this at once determines the scope of their field of enquiry. Some writers are of opinion that it makes a great deal of difference whether or no the entire collection be rejected in whole or in part. Those who argue for the retention of the pastorals do so, in part at least, because of a desire to trace the organization of the Church to Paul.

In so far as Pauline thought is concerned in its theological phases, it may be considered sufficient to restrict an enquiry to the first ten-mentioned epistles, as there is nothing outside of them that exerts an appreciable influence one way or the other upon the outcome of the controversy. It cannot be too often emphasized that the Pauline collection does

not represent a theological system. The letters are essentially of an occasional character, produced in response to an expressed desire, or to meet a practical exigency; but essentially their value was conceived to be of a temporary nature, and there was no possible thought that they would ever serve the ends of the radical critics in the past half century. Much is sometimes made of the argument from silence, the fact that Paul does not make reference to a particular point being taken to signify that he was not necessarily unaware of the existence of such a fact. This is not very satisfactory. It is somewhat on a par with the contention that if Paul had not performed the task of liberating the Church from Judaism someone else would have done so. The fact remains that Paul did, and he must be given the praise or blame that attaches to his historical contribution. It is not fair, on the other hand, to assume that the records we have represent the final and complete thought of Paul. It is fairly evident that there were many letters written by him which are lost to us. Doubtless, also, there were situations he was not called to meet and which therefore were not entertained in his thinking.

Apart from the Pauline letters we have the latter part of the book of Acts as a source for Pauline thought and life. These constitute our primary sources. It is fair to accept the testimony of Acts as giving us a genuine historical knowledge of Paul's speeches, doubtless, of course, compressed by the author, as is common with other New Testament writings. In some quarters there is considered to obtain the alternative of accepting either the testimony of Paul or that of Acts on points where they appear to differ. The soundest principle

seems to be that Paul is to be given priority as his thought is represented in his epistles, and that the book of Acts may be considered to be complementary to what he says and does. His letters are the earliest literary witness to Christianity. We may regard them as genuine letters written within a period of two or three decades from the time when Jesus lived. He is therefore our oldest Christian authority.

An attempt is sometimes made to divide the epistles into periods or sections corresponding to historical differences, with differences also in thought and sometimes in language. Then again, endeavors are made to trace a development in Paul's thought along certain lines. This raises the vexed question as to whether his revelation was a final one, or whether he underwent an evolution of thought. In fairness to the apostle, the latter view seems the more reasonable, as it is truer to the material he has bequeathed to us, and makes his experience more normal and more acceptable to the average reader. We start with comparatively sure ground with Paul because of the relatively large mass of material at our disposal - a situation which is quite different from that in the case of Jesus, where so much reconstruction is necessary, and where we have to understand the mind of Jesus as it is transmitted to us through that of several entirely different personalities. It has been already remarked that in view of the priority of the Pauline letters it is surprising to find that the gospels are so comparatively free from Pauline influence. There is no critical necessity for querying the genuineness of any feature in the teaching of Jesus merely on the ground that it reappears in the teaching of Paul. Mere similarity of words does not imply similarity of origin or thought. This tendency to read

in comparisons and indebtedness of source material is pushed to excess both in the treatment of Jesus' teachings as compared with those of Paul, and in the comparison of the latter with Hellenistic literature.

There is a growing tendency to pay more and more attention to the environment in which Paul lived and worked and to trace its probable influences on his thought. A great deal of work has been done by Jewish scholars to indicate the relation between the Pauline letters and the Rabbinical teachings which he imbibed at the feet of Gamaliel. These Jewish influences may be said to be reflected in the canonical literature, the post-canonical literature, and in contemporary thought. His Christian sources may be considered to be the facts concerning Christ, the teaching of Christ so far as this had reached the apostle through the earliest disciples, and the primitive interpretation of these facts. And, finally, there would be the question of his indebtedness to Hellenistic influences and the sources of this influence.

Pfleiderer endeavors to support his contention that the historical Jesus uttered remarks in the Pauline letters by tracing certain relations between Mark and Galatians, Mark and Romans, and Mark and Corinthians. "In proportion as the Jewish spirit of the Church in Palestine lacked the power to appreciate the reformatory opposition of Jesus to Judaism, the more important was it in the interests of Christianity that the evangelist Mark had his eyes opened and trained in the school of Paul to see what was new in principle in the mission and teaching of Jesus."(I). If Jesus spoke as he did about his death and resurrection, it is hard to understand such utterances unless

---

(I). Pfleiderer,O.:"Primitive Christianity", pl40.

he pointedly indicates their inability to understand these two cardinal points of the Pauline gospel. It is contended that Mark presents the Pauline school, whereas Matthew on the other hand defends the view of Jewish Christianity. In Luke Paulinism is once again heard - it is a popularized irenical Paulinism of the second post-apostolic generation directed against an unbelieving Judaism.

It does not suffice to think of Paul as little understood by his contemporaries; propounding opinions that were entertained and grasped by practically nobody but himself. If this had been the case his letters would never have survived, as no Church would have thought them worth preserving. Their existence in such numbers shows clearly that in him we have a generally accepted exponent of Christian truths.

b. Jesus.

There is probably no other single problem in the whole of the Jesus-Paul controversy which is of more vital importance than to discover the significance of the life and teachings of Jesus for our day and generation. The second point of emphasis is to establish to what extent this primary fountain of truth was corrupted, if at all, by the reflections of Paul. The work of Strauss was epoch-making in the life-of-Jesus research. His radical criticisms dealt drastic blows to the traditional notions of the Church. As a result of the vast amount of research expended upon such a study, it can be reasonably affirmed that modern thought is closer today to the actual Jesus of history than at any time since the days of the first disciples. From this there follows the very natural tendency to suppose that if this be the case, then we can dispense with the Pauline interpretation as being a supererogation on the part of the apostle. Experience proves this to be a fallacy. German theology was in great danger of transmuting the Jesus of history into a German Jesus of the nineteenth century. The old fallacy is once more manifest, namely, the impossibility of building an adequate faith merely by intellectual assent to the sayings of a historical person. There are other examples of ethical teaching and purity of life which might serve to bear comparison with those of Jesus. Yet historically they have all proved inadequate as world religions. The historical Jesus cannot be lifted out of the environment in which he lived his days without doing violence to the historical method. There are some intellectuals who appear to be satisfied with mere assent to the teachings of Jesus. Paul has vital significance

for us here because of the value of his witness to the significance of the person of Jesus; and according to the answer we render to this phase of the subject are we ranged on one side or the other in the controversy as to who was the founder of Christianity. Two major issues are involved. What do the sources teach us that is essentially verifiable about the person of Jesus, and to what extent did he make provision for the continuance of his work?

A. His Religion.

What answer can we give as to the conception Jesus entertained of his own person and work? Those who think that they have plumbed the depths of Jesus' personality and place limits to his human consciousness are rather confident when they accuse his followers of straightway apotheosizing, if not deifying, Jesus. But the matter cannot rest there. Rightly or wrongly, his followers felt that the spirit of Jesus was with them still, and that he had the value of God for them in the sense that in no other way could they arrive at any satisfactory realization of the presence of God in human life. The career of Paul is inexplicable apart from this consideration. To say that Jesus thought of himself in an exclusively Messianic sense, or on the other extreme in a strictly eschatological sense, is simply to state two conflicting hypotheses based upon the same body of facts. All such attempts will probably in the last analysis remain abortive. The religious consciousness of Jesus is not subject to measurement or limitation. In order to be apprehended it must first be given its rightful expression in human life. In this sense it has always proved an illimitable reservoir of spiritual power and energy.

Primarily Jesus was a religious genius. His life and work must be considered in its relation to Judaism, the soil out of which it sprang, and apart from which it would be an insoluble enigma. Among the elements which went to make up the background of Jesus' religious thinking was the Old Testament, which made a distinctively individual contribution to his personal and religious life. He was doubtless familiar with the apocalyptic literature of his time. He did not employ the Rabbinical method in the propagation of his message. He did not read the Old Testament in order to secure official credentials for himself, as his disciples were to do later. He used the book of his people in a purely personal way, and he treated the writings as devotional documents. There is no gainsaying the fact that the sacred book formed an authoritative element in his religious consciousness. It was for him a source of ultimate triumph in the severest struggles of the soul. In his treatment of it he exercised personal freedom, and rejected as well as accepted its contents. He was a religious critic and preferred the prophetic and personal type of religion.

A further element was made up of the prophetic predecessors of Jesus. He was himself a prophetic personality, and the prophets formed the religious background out of which it was historically possible for Jesus to appear. He was prophetic in his conception of religion as moral and inward, as ethical, and as purity of heart.

John the Baptist formed the contemporaneous element which served to give significance and point to the advent of Jesus upon the stage of the world's history. The two men had much in common, and Jesus took up the work of the Baptist where the

latter was compelled to lay it down. The exact extent of their relationship is not now clear to us, but it is evident from the estimate that Jesus entertained of the personality of John that their contributions can be considered in the light of the part to the whole, in the relationship of the imperfect to the perfect.

Jesus was genuinely Jewish in all his thought and ways. He accepted the religious beliefs of his day. God and His kingdom are the two focal points of the religious faith of Jesus. His faith in God was a social inheritance - mainly it is fundamentally that of his people. His God is the God of primitive personal piety whose existence and ethical character are assumed without formal proof. He had an experience of God as Holy and an experience of God as Father. As Father Jesus saw God in nature, in human history, and in the fates and fortunes of the individual group. For him God's most certain revelation of Himself is in human life and experience. We can describe the whole of his experience as religious, and therefore genuinely human. Issuing from his experience of God as a holy and loving Father, we find in Jesus the two fundamentally religious elements of dependence and a feeling of confidence in God. Regularly and without exception he is deeply reverent in his attitude toward God. He feels that there are religious restrictions set for his own life and work. He interpreted religious living wholly in terms of the Divine will.

"The strict Jewish monotheism that was the nerve and fiber of Jesus' experience of God, would make it impossible for him to see himself as a religious object....The common idea is that Jesus founded a religion - Christianity. But it would

be better to say - Jesus became a religion. Christianity from the moment of its birth was a religion about Jesus rather than the religion of Jesus."(I).

Strauss in 1835 set the alternative - the 'Jesus of history' or 'the Christ of faith'. Wrede later contended that Jesus never held himself to be the Messiah, and never gave himself out to be the Messiah. His Messiahship dates from his death according to this writer. In Wrede's opinion this contention is supported from the religious experience of Peter and Paul. He would maintain that the opening chapters of the book of Acts are thus important in the history of Christology. The Messianic materials in the gospels are therefore unhistorical if this view be accepted. At the same time, in 1901, Schweitzer contended for the exclusively Messianic consciousness of Jesus. Jesus was aware of it from the first but kept it a secret. The Synoptics nowhere record that the general public accepted Jesus as the Messiah.

We must recognize the fact that no dogmatic assertions can be made as to Jesus' consciousness of his own significance. The evidence is not conclusive. The essential fact to be grasped was the sublimity of his life and the loftiness of his message. It is not contended that these features are to be considered in water-tight compartments. Christianity would be inadequate if we had the one without the other. It is impossible to give any adequate treatment of the teachings of Jesus in such a small compass. It will suffice to show that the essential concepts of Christianity had their foundation in what Jesus taught. The significance of this is not lessened

(I). Bundy, W.E.: "The Religion of Jesus", p277.

even if it be contended that such conceptions were not original. They certainly displayed a more spiritual insight than had ever been known before, and preeminently they were reenforced by a faith and a life which gave them a power that no other body of teachings has ever possessed. Some attention will be devoted to the ordinances of Christianity, as it is now generally recognized that Jesus did not formally institute an organization, and it is therefore inferred that he was not the founder of Christianity. But all the founders of religions do not necessarily have to be organizers. If the mere fact of organization entitles one to be a founder, then Christianity has a whole galaxy of founders, for of necessity its organization must change to meet changing needs. Furthermore, if the observance of sacraments constitutes one a Christian, many who claim the title today are masquerading under false pretenses. Surely to have left a message and lived a life that was the very incarnation of that message - a message and a life that have been the inspiration and hope of millions down the ages - is sufficient to justify the claim that is made for Jesus as the founder of Christianity.

B. His Message.

1. The Fatherhood of God.

The two major emphases of Jesus' teaching rested on his conception of the Fatherhood of God and on the Kingdom of God. Although much of his thought had already been expressed by the prophets of old, it remained for Jesus to take up all the threads and unite them into an harmonious conception that transcended all preceding notions by the very daring and majesty of it all. He corrected the legalistic views of his

religious predecessors, and stressed the intimacy of the personal relationship with God. Latent in all his thoughts of God was a universal element that pushed back the barriers of Judaism and took all mankind into partnership in a common heritage. God for Jesus was the God of all men; but not all men were the sons of God in equal measure. Potentially they were, but sonship was a prize which merited ethical striving and effort on the part of man. Jesus was the Son of God in a special sense because of the intimate personal relationship he shared with the Heavenly Father. Once again, it is necessary to emphasize the fact that we cannot separate the man from his message. Jesus demonstrated the love of God for men by his willingness to give his life for them. We are not to suppose that this was done with any thought of placating God's wrath to man, as this was a legalistic conception which traditional Christianity borrowed from Judaism. All metaphysical conceptions of his Sonship must be discarded.

ii. The Kingdom of God.

In substance he thinks of the kingdom as prophetic. Through all the variations as to the nature and consummation of the kingdom runs the certain confidence that God will establish it. His message of the kingdom of God was simply the natural expression of his own personal religious faith. It was his religious conception of the future that is its important element for Jesus and for us. He makes the Kingdom of God the cause he espouses. For him the Kingdom of God is simply the divine cause in human life and history. The kingdom of God will embody the conceptions of Jesus as to the ethical relationships between God and man as these are worked out in practice. It may be near, it may be far; but always it is in process of

becoming. It does not come by observation, but silently and surely as the life-giving processes manifest themselves in the onward workings of the universe.

In Jesus' preaching the decisive severance from the national element had already taken place - with the idea of the kingdom of God the universalization of the gospel is already present in embryo. It did not lose its freshness when Paul finally broke the bonds of nationality, and carried the torch of the gospel over to the Gentiles. The near approach of the kingdom forms the background of his teaching. He assumes an acquaintance with its meaning. His significance lies in the demonstration of the right way of salvation. He desires to promote the right observance of the law. The best he had to give us was himself, and this he gave continually.

The point we desire to make is that the Church was to take the place of the kingdom of God, or better still, was to be the kingdom. It is quite likely, altogether probable in fact, that Jesus did not dream of the developments that would succeed his death. It is still more certain that these developments would not have occurred but for that death and the seal it put upon his message. It is not going too far to say that Jesus and his disciples represented the first Christian Church.

iii. Baptism.

Did Jesus institute the sacrament of baptism and the Lord's Supper? There are those who aver that if he did not, somebody else had to, on the ground that religion is inseparable from ritual and ceremonialism. The thesis that Jesus commanded his disciples to baptize, as established in the Trinitarian formula at the close of Matthew's gospel is no longer regarded

as historical. Further, there is no evidence to support the view that Jesus personally baptized. The question is immediately to the fore, since if Jesus neither baptized nor commanded his disciples so to do, where did they get the idea? The disciples of John the Baptist followed the practice of their master, and a natural rivalry between the two bodies would ensure that the new movement would not long remain without the practice of the old, more especially as Jesus had set a personal precedent in this connection. There is no definite information as to the ultimate source of the rite, its origin being wrapped in antiquity.

iv. The Lord's Supper.

The situation is different with respect to the Lord's Supper. It is easy for dogmatically minded theologians to quote the gospels as positive evidence in favor of the founding of the rite by Jesus. This will be considered in greater detail in relation to Paul's teaching. It suffices to state that the accounts are not historically to be understood in this light. The practice of observing the feast began from the first, but it seems to have been observed rather in the spiritual light of a memorial feast than as a sacrament. It is not historically conceivable that Jesus could have foreseen the developments of the future, and to connect the bread and the wine as symbols with the broken body and shed blood of Jesus is so obviously an inference read in by the later authors as to destroy the historical value of the institutional theory.

v. The Church.

Both of these aspects are closely linked with the consideration as to whether or not Jesus founded an

organization. He seems to have deliberately refrained from drawing unto himself a large body of followers, and staked the possibility of the continuance of his message upon his personal influence with a limited body of disciples. The conduct of the disciples after the crucifixion is the best indirect evidence as to their understanding of the mind of Jesus for them. Undoubtedly they failed to see all the implications of his message for the world - a situation which set the stage for the Pauline contribution. They seem to have had no consuming desire to do any constructive work until they became convinced that the spirit of Jesus was still with them. Even then there was no attempt at organization. A synoptic view of the situation leads to the conclusion that the organization developed as the needs of the growing body of believers demanded that it should, rather than that they set out to establish some preordained plan of Jesus.

6. The Primitive Christian Community in its Relation to Jesus and Paul.

It is time to consider the place and importance of the primitive community as constituting an important intermediate factor between Jesus and Paul. It is difficult to avoid superlatives in considering the vital place that these early Christians occupied in their relation to the future history of the Church. It was his contact with them that first started the mind of Paul on its quest for the truth as it was in Jesus. Indirectly, he did the cause a great service by scattering its members abroad through his persecuting methods. The disciples were the best living demonstration of the reality of the religious experience of Jesus by their own faith in their Master, and by their joy and willingness to risk all for that faith. It is not to be gainsaid that they were at first ignorant of all that was implied in the words and deeds of Jesus. That is only a mild imputation, as mankind has not yet succeeded in doing what they failed to do, even though we have the assistance of Paul and his successors down the ages.

There is no evidence to warrant the assumption that the first disciples in any wise considered themselves as constituting an organized Church. In fact they had at first had no definite thought of severing themselves from Judaism, being content to maintain the same freedom with regard to the observance of, and respect for the spirit of the law, as was originally manifested by Jesus. So powerfully were the more Judaistic of their number still in bondage to the law that they continued to insist on any additions to their numbers entering through the gate of the law until finally Paul

destroyed such a conception. But even before Paul, the Hellenizing members of the Church had begun the process which he was to precipitate. As a matter of fact, it was because of the clearly manifested practical exigencies of the absorption of the Gentile converts, that Paul was first induced to take up the matter with the chief apostles. Stephen seems to have been the natural predecessor of Paul in his particular field. It was an historical necessity that the new faith, which only gradually came into the consciousness of its newness, should separate itself from Judaism. It is impossible to estimate the loss occasioned by such a separation to the sum total of the latent spiritual forces in the old faith.

Paul was indebted to the primitive community in more ways than one. But there were others in the early Church who had the missionary spirit as well as Paul. Unfortunately their labors are more or less wrapped in obscurity. Paul had nothing to do with the founding of the Churches in Africa which later became a prominent Christian center. He was not even responsible for the first Church in Antioch. The three great centers of Christian influence, Antioch, Rome, and Alexandria, were founded by other workers. The Churches founded by Paul were afterwards the storm centers of controversy and heresy. This was not his fault, nor does it detract in any wise from the sweep of his organizing genius. It simply puts natural limits even to the genius of a Paul, and serves to make allowance for the presence of other forces and other personalities than his own in the forward march of the Church. Paul's gospel was essentially the same as that of the apostles at Jerusalem: had it been otherwise, it would not have been accepted, as there were any number of witnesses to refute false teaching. But no

doubt seems to have been cast upon the witness of the Pauline epistles. They recognized his peculiar fitness for the task as apostle to the Gentiles. His work is incomprehensible apart from a consideration of the existence of this primitive Christian community. Wherever Paul went he addressed himself in the first instance to his own fellow-countrymen, and apparently expected them to receive and understand the same gospel he offered to the Gentiles.

Christianity was in its very essence a universal religion. To Paul is due the credit for the supreme expression of this element, and to him was given the honor of making his contribution at such a time and in such a way as to render it second only to that of the founder of Christianity himself; a contribution so splendid and farreaching as to occasion all this present day controversy, and to impress many with the idea that he, and he alone, founded Christianity as we know it today.

The Christianity of the early Church was not a world religion. It did have a new and freer conception of God than Judaism, but maintained a certain adherence to the law. Life and faith were to be counted as among its special characteristics. It was, however, more than a merely revived and completed Judaism. It had latent elements that were to make it something new and world embracing.

Paul did not conceive his work to be the establishment of a new religion as compared with that which he had previously persecuted. He is Christian rather than Pauline when he preaches the return of the crucified Jesus. Gentile Christianity was not a new creation by Paul, although the process of expansion by which Christianity made conquest of the Gentile world begins to appear clearly in his work. He was one with the earlier Jewish

Christians in certain aspects of his teaching, while in others he went his own way. One of the conspicuous features of his independence is seen in his attitude toward ceremonial observances. The centrality of the spirit is one of the clearest items in the religion of Paul.

"Paul's conception of religion and of religious history was extremely simple if one looks at its kernel, for it was based upon one fact. It cannot be reduced to a brief formula without being distorted into a platitude. It is never vital except in the shape of a paradox. In place of the particular forms of expression which Paul introduced, and by means of which he made the conception valid and secure for himself, it was possible that others might arise, as was the case in the very next generation with the author of Hebrews, and with the anonymous genius who composed the Johannine writings. But what they transformed was not the fruit and kernel of Paulinism."(I).

Paul was convinced that the death and resurrection of Jesus had inaugurated a new age; but this conception was shared by all the other followers of Jesus.

"This it was which enabled Paul, Jew and Pharisee as he was, to venture upon the great conception with which he laid the basis of any sound philosophy of religion and of the whole science of comparative religion, namely, the collocation of the 'natural' knowledge of God possessed by man, (that is, all that is developed in man under the sway of conscience), with the law of the chosen people."(2).

Inevitably the teaching of Jesus underwent certain changes which were destined to affect the whole of its later history. In the first place the disciples put the emphasis

(I). Harnack,A.:"Mission and Expansion of Christianity", Vol 1 p 56. (2). Ibid., p 55.

upon the person of Jesus himself. His death and resurrection were thought to overshadow all the rest. They now thought of Jesus as the exalted Lord whom they expected to return, and who had meanwhile endowed his people with the gift of the spirit. Both Paul and his predecessors were simply bent on expressing what Jesus meant for them religiously. Essentially his conception was the same as theirs - practically it went beyond theirs due to his wider experience. His conception of Jesus springs from an inward sense of possession by the grace of God in Jesus Christ.

> Referring to the period "From Baur to Holtzmann" Schweitzer says - "In general the writers of this period are involved in the most curious confusions regarding the problem of 'Jesus and Paul'. They fail to perceive that these two magnitudes are not directly comparable with one another, because they think of Paul in complete isolation, and not as a feature of primitive Christianity. The differences and oppositions which reveal themselves between the teachings of Jesus and that of Paul exist also as between the teaching of Jesus and that of primitive Christianity itself. The momentous development did not arise first with Paul, but earlier in the community of the first disciples. Their 'religion' is not identical with the 'teaching of Jesus', and did not simply grow out of it; it is founded upon his death and resurrection. The 'new element' was not brought into Christianity by Paul; he found it there before him and what he did was to think it out in its logical implications. The difference of teaching between Paul and Jesus is not a difference between individuals - it is - in almost its whole extent - due to the fact that the apostle belongs to primitive Christianity."(I).

Schweitzer takes some of the writers ofthe present century to task for leaving out of account a consideration of primitive Christianity, and goes on to say - "The credit of having expressed this clearly, and thus put an end to the unproritable wrangling about 'Jesus and Paul'or 'Jesus or Paul', belongs to Harnack. It, he writes in the 1909 edition of his 'History of Dogma', even in the first generation the religion

(I). Schweitzer,A.:"Paul and His Interpreters", p45.

of Jesus underwent a change, it must be said that it was not Paul who was responsible for this but the primitive Christian community."(1). "It is highly probable that the Baptist and primitive Christianity created eschatological sacraments, which, as already established and accredited, Paul had only to take over."(2).

There seems to be a general consensus of opinion that their faith expressed itself in the formula "Jesus is the Messiah". The important thing for us is to try and discover where and how they came into possession of this knowledge. The idea was present in embryo and crystallized round the person of Jesus. It was unacceptable to Greek speculation and Hebrew theology, but conquered by the personal devotion and joy, the enthusiasm and passion of its exponents, willing as they were to hazard their lives to the death for their cause. The Resurrection is the only explanation of their enthusiasm. It was for them sufficient proof of the Messiahship of Jesus.

"The moment at which the first Christian sent up his prayer to the exalted Christ, is the birth hour of that religion which to many Christians up to the present time, appears to be the only true Christianity alone entitled to the name."(3).

Machen establishes the following interesting propositions,

1. "The relation between Paul and the original disciples of Jesus was cordial; there is no reason to interpret the 'right hand of fellowship' which the leaders of the Jerusalem Church gave to Paul in any other than its full meaning, and no reason to suppose that the good relationship

(1). Schweitzer,A.:"Paul and His Interpreters", p160. (2) Ibid., p 245.
(3). Weiss,J.:"Christ: The Beginnings of Dogma", p47f.

was broken off at any later time,

ii, The early training of Paul was thoroughly Jewish, and was fundamentally Palestinian, not Hellenistic; and Paul never relinquished his attachment to his own people,

iii, Paul's attitude towards paganism, after the conversion as well as before it, was an attitude of abhorrence. If common ground was ever sought with his pagan hearers, it was only as a starting point for the denunciation of idolatry, and the proclamation of a revealed gospel.(I).

> "The criticism of the gospel history so far as it immediately concerns the life of the Founder of Christianity, with which so many weighty questions are allied, will long remain the most important object of the critical labors of our time. In view of the interests of the problem, there next follows the historical and critical inquiry into the question how Christianity, so closely interwoven with Judaism, broke loose from it and entered on its sphere of world-wide historical importance. In regard to the life of Jesus, the conscious idea of Christianity and its principles, originated by him, and by him carried out through the devotion of his whole being, is what the gospel history presents to us as the essence of the historical meaning of his life. But when we proceed from the evangelical history to that of the time of the apostles, the practical realization of that idea becomes the proper object of historical research. This practical realization of the idea of Christianity was first dealt with when entering into the reality of its consciousness through the death and resurrection of Jesus, and becoming of itself a living power, the idea found in the bounds of the national Judaism the chief obstacle to its universal historical relaization. How these bounds were broken through, how Christianity, instead of remaining a mere form of Judaism, although a progressive one, asserted itself as a separate, independent principle, broke loose from it, and took its stand as a new enfranchised form of religious thought and life, essentially different from all the national peculiarities of Judaism, is the ultimate, most important point of the primitive history of Christianity. Here also, as in the gospel history, the individuality of a single life is the peculiar object of the historical and critical enquiry. That Christianity, in its universal historical acceptation, was the work of the apostle Paul is undeniably an historical matter of fact, but in what manner he

(I). Machen,J.G.:"The Origin of Paul's Religion", pII3.

> achieved this, in what light his relations with the elder apostles must be viewed; whether it was in harmony with them or in contradiction and opposition to them that he first authoritatively laid down principles and opinions; this it is that deserves a most thorough and accurate inquiry."(I).

This latter statement is not altogether acceptable as it stands. It does not distinguish clearly enough between the contribution of Paul as an organizer and his contribution as a thinker. He would have been a great organizer in any case - he made his intellectual contribution because he had something to think about in the person and work of Jesus. We have seen thus far something of the uniqueness of the foundation work of Jesus, limited as it was by time and space. We have seen also that the movement which was afterwards to take its name from him began to grow rapidly and to take the same attitude to Judaism as Jesus had adopted. Exactly when his followers became conscious that they were espousing a new religion it is impossible to determine. They form an indispensable link between Jesus and Paul, as the latter was dependent for his knowledge of Jesus upon the information supplied to him by the primitive Christian Church, (except where this was speculation on his own part); the inspiration they imparted to him made them equally indispensable.

(I). Baur,F.C.:"Paul", Vol I, ppr.

7. Paul.

Probably the most important feature of the controversy is the interpretation that is made of the Pauline contribution. What exactly did the speculative mind of Paul do with the simple gospel message? It is usually granted, and with justice, that the atmosphere of the Pauline writings is different from that of the gospels. This raises the question as to the difference in the backgrounds of Jesus and Paul, and as to the extent to which Paul was influenced by contemporary thought. Such a consideration gives rise to a wide field of conjecture, and explains the somewhat extraordinary hypotheses which have been already instanced as finding support from radical critics. A text-book on Pauline theology is the reverse of simplicity in thought. However, Paul did not set out to build up a system of doctrine. Ordinarily his thoughts on single questions of doctrine are culled from the entire field of his writings. This is perhaps a necessary evil. He fails to mention certain features in some of his letters because a treatment of/them was not called forth by the particular needs of his hearers. Therefore, the best procedure would doubtless be to trace his thought in a chronological way. There are certain dangers to be avoided. There is always a great risk attached to the interpretation of any passage when severed from its context. Furthermore, it is a basic requirement in scientific enquiry always to proceed with the minimum number of solutions of any one problem. A great deal of material that is written does not fulfil these requirements. Here it is purposed to deal (by no means exhaustively), with certain of the features of Pauline thought that have received the major consideration in the controversy, with a view to ascertaining exactly what Paul

did, and did not, contribute, to the primitive gospel. The order of selection is more or less arbitrary: there is, for example, no intention of implying that his religion and ethics were in any wise separate - they are treated as such for the purpose of presenting his contribution from its admittedly many-sided aspects, even as we have arbitrarily separated the person of Jesus from his message.

A. His Personal Religion.

A few introductory observations will serve to prepare the ground for a consideration of this and subsequent topics. Attempts have been made to cite Hellenistic and Stoic influences as contributory to the Pauline system of thought. Some writers reject such a proposition outright, while others admit its pertinency to a greater or lesser extent. No conclusive judgment can be drawn from the Pauline sources. There is no question, however, that the influence of late Judaism formed the chief background of his speculative thought. Hellenistic and Gnostic influences came to him through this channel rather than directly; at any rate in the first instance. There was a germ of Paulinism in late Judaism, but a significant development is evident in the writings of Paul, and must be explained by new factors, such as his own peculiar genius and the influences that played upon him. Some scholars trace the influence of Stoicism in his native town of Tarsus as playing a large part in his thought. He was influenced by the Jewish Torah and by the Rabbinism in which he was trained. The doctrines of primitive Christianity also made their contribution. In a sense their religion had become a new thing; embodying as it did a faith with an emphasis on the death and resurrection of Jesus, so that we cannot regard these elements as having been

brought into Christianity by Paul. From the beginning he stood on the ground of Hellenistic or Gentile Christianity. His conversion must be considered from its intellectual side. It meant for him a new conception in terms of the spirit rather than of the letter. Stephen's liberalism probably led him to recognize the fundamental difference between the teaching of Jesus and that of Judaism. One was a religion of the spirit; the other a religion of the letter. He gained at once a new life - his theology was a slow development of the years. It is natural to suppose that he began with the earliest Jewish conception of Christianity. In Thessalonians the main doctrine of the Parousia is Judean; there is no trace of any distinctive Alexandrian doctrine. That which explains Paul's own conversion and way of life explains also the fundamental inspiration of his writing. The process of faith does not begin with a theology but with a way of life. So runs the story according to certain modern authors.

Mysticism is a characteristic of developed Paulinism as it was of the Mysteries. Contemporary thought was only an influence and not a determinant in the acceptance by Paul of the nobler Mysteries of his day. One source of his doctrine of the inward Christ is the historical Jesus. The strength and abiding worth of Paulinism lies in its spiritual and ethical emphasis; an element that lies at the root of the apocalyptic forms, the Hellenistic speculation, and the conceptions of the Church and the Sacraments which he gives us. In so far as the Mysteries are allowed to influence Christianity they are transformed by a strong ethical interest; the physical and psychical elements are made to serve the moral. His central theme and concern was Christian character. He did not advance

beyond Jesus in his ethics, but made a new contribution in speculative religious thought.

We can discern the influence of Jesus upon Paul only indirectly. The greatness of the earliest form of Christianity was essentially constituted by two historical realities - Jesus and the community which attached itself to him. There is a clear distinction between Jesus and Paul as regards the effects of their labors. Both bound up religion and the claims of morality, but the emphasis was a very different one.

In support of the contention that Jewish influences predominated over Hellenistic in Paul the following points or factors should be noted -

i. His pride of race was so strong and persistent as to be inconsistent with anything that could be called cosmopolitanism.

ii. He was, and remained to the end, an uncompromising monotheist.

iii. He assumed God to be knowable and to have a character which had been ascertained.

iv. He uses the Old Testament for illustration and a religious vocabulary.

v. His ideal was a society of men in whom the age-long purpose of God was being fulfilled. The core and marrow of his teaching was continuous with, and finds its basis in, the teaching of the Old Testament.

"Paul's mysticism seems to have been derived from no one source in particular, as from Philo or some of the Mystery-cults. It was rather absorbed in a perfectly natural and partly unconscious way from his Graeco-Roman environment, in which mysticism was a very prominent and important factor."(I).

(I). Quoted from Hatch,"Influence of Greek Ideas", p 66 in Angus, "The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World."

His mysticism differed from that of the Mystery Religions

i. as regards the human factor there was a conspicuous absence of any idea of absorption in the deity. He valued personality, individuality, and will too highly. His was an active fellowship rather than an absorption in Christ:

ii. as regards the divine factor "in mystic fellowship the faith-mysticism of Paul is faith grounded on an historic personality to whose love faith is the necessary response. He becomes like Christ, but never Christ."(I).

The gospel is for Paul one of redemption or deliverance - it concentrates attention upon the proof of God's love afforded by redemption.

"The heart of his religion is belief in a new status of the soul which is ultimately due to an act of gracious love on the part of God himself."(2).

It was part of his inheritance from the Christian community that he was convinced that Jesus Christ had suffered for the sins of men. The origin of Paul's religion has to do with the origin of Christianity; the latter point is of both historical and practical importance. Where the ordinary conception of the Christian movement has been abandoned, the Christian experience connected with it has ceased. There are those who maintain that the conception of Christianity is not dpendent upon its origin; that essentially it is a matter of life. As contrasted with Jesus, the testimony of Paul forms a fixed starting point in all such controversy. It comprises both what he has to say in detail about the words and deeds of the Founder of the Christian movement, and still more important, the testimony of his experience as a whole.

(1). Angus,S.:"Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World",p296.
(2). Moffatt,J.:"Love in the New Testament", p4-5.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

As Machen points out - "The religion of Paul is not a fact which stands in the full light of history. How is it to be explained? What were its presuppositions? Upon what sort of Jesus was it founded? These questions lead into the very heart of the historical problem. Explain the origin of the religion of Paul and you have solved the problem of the origin of Christianity."(I). He goes on to point out that the religion of Paul is a phenomenon which has been explained in four different ways.

i. Supernaturalistic. This view regards Jesus as a heavenly being who came to earth and returned. It leaves nothing to explain as to Paul's presuppositions about Jesus.

ii. The liberal view regards Jesus as the highest type of man. It distinguishes between the religion and the theology of Paul; the former is to be retained and the latter rejected.

iii. Wrede's radical view that the religion and theology of Paul stand or fall together. He concluded that Paul's religion was not based at all upon Jesus of Nazareth - that Paul was the second Founder of Christianity. The Pauline conception of Christ was derived from a pre-Christian conception of the Messiah which Paul already had before his conversion.

iv. Machen agrees with Wrede in rejecting the liberal derivation of the religion of Paul from an impression of the historical person of Jesus, and differs from him in the source from which Paul's religion is actually to be derived, namely, the contemporary pagan religion.

Paul conceived the essence of religion to be faith in its widest sense. Man must feel his dependence on God and place an

(I). Machen,J.G.:"The Origin of Paul's Religion", p4f.

unlimited trust in him. He combines it with a certain amount and kind of action. At the bottom of his universalism is his view of the absoluteness of God. He always refers to God as an essential element in his thought.

"Christianity indeed is simply the negation of all particularism to the end that the pure and absolute idea of God may be realized in humanity."(I).

B. Ethics.

There is no doctrine in the teaching of Jesus. It has been shown that this is not the case with Paul. His ethical teaching is full of genius and originality. Again, some see in this the traces of Stoicism derived from his Tarsus residence. Paul differs widely from the current morality and is opposed to both Pharisaism and Stoicism. He seldom quotes any sayings from the Synoptics as we have them. There is more often a marked parallelism between the Pauline teaching and the Synoptic discourses, yet Paul does not seem to be consciously borrowing. The spirit behind the letter reveals a remarkable likeness between the teaching of Jesus in the Synoptics and that of Paul. What is in the Synoptics the spirit or the life of Jesus is to Paul the spirit of the life of Christ. There is a spiritual kinship of a kind in their attitude towards the Roman law. Paul comes nearest to Jesus in his exaltation of the specifically Christian virtues of gentleness, meekness, and peacefulness. The principle of his ethics lies in a mystical enthusiasm. The Divine righteousness is won by trust in a power which works within. His morality, like all his other beliefs and ideas, is directly derived from his doctrine of salvation by faith. The faith through which we are justified unites us with Christ. Life in the spirit was one

(I). Baur, F.C.: "Paul", Vol 2, p258.

of the most real facts in Christian experience. The result of the indwelling of God's spirit is a transformation of nature. Life in Christ, life in the spirit, sums up the whole of our religious life, and these represent the same life viewed from different standpoints. The leading characteristic of Paul's morality is that it is a morality of principle and not of law. A second great principle is that of purity. It involves a sanctification of all the relations of life through the new conditions. In studying his ethics we see more clearly than in any other connection the relation of his teaching to that of Christ. It was to the teaching of Christ that Paul owed his conception of love as the fundamental principle of morality.

There are two main elements in his teaching as a whole; his mental equipment as a Jew and the Christian system as he received it: the two are unified and transformed by the overpowering conviction of redemption through Christ and life in Christ. Paul felt that his grasp and apprehension of what the gospel implied was not due to the direct influence of the apostles but to what he felt was an inspiration. He must have long known the leading tenets of the Christian faith; it was a revelation from God that made him accept that faith as true, and realize all that it implied. He builds up his gospel on an historical basis. The foundations were the death and resurrection of Jesus - facts with which he was acquainted by human testimony. His information of the Synoptic gospels was expressed directly in his moral teaching and indirectly in his doctrines. The personal claims of Christ were earlier than the theological interpretation of Paul. The ultimate source of his teaching was the life and words of Jesus. Even the actual development of Christianity was not due to Paul: his Christianity was the

Christianity of the Church.

We will now consider the particular points which were peculiar to him and which he brought into Christianity. His influence was twofold. Because of his Rabbinical training he became the first Christian theologian and wrote the first Christian theology. The second part of his contribution was due to the reality of his Christianity, which was such that he saw the issues more clearly, had greater spiritual power and insight, and knew the mind of Jesus better than many who had been with him in the flesh. He was thus able to grasp more fully than his contemporaries what Christianity meant. Faith, discipleship, love give us the key to all that he taught. The specifically Pauline doctrines became prominent at different epochs, often in an exaggerated form. The starting point of the Christian religion for Paul was the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus as they are recorded for us in the gospels.

From Jesus came ultimately the great truths of Christianity and its moral teaching, which were intended to serve as guiding principles and not to be formulated into rules. The early Christians studied the Old Testament to throw light on the person and work of Jesus and gradually built up the life and teachings of the Church. They had already begun to separate themselves from Judaism and to realize a universal mission. Paul learnt the Jesus tradition and accepted Christianity as it was then taught. His religious personality inspired the nascent Church with a faith, and the growing creed with a meaning, which it had not till then realized.

But there are transient elements in his ethics. He answers

the needs of the times with a reiterated and passionately cherished ideal of moral liberty. His second determining element of Christian morals was the possession of a sense of power. At this point the convergence of his teaching with that of Jesus is unmistakable. He overcomes the spiritual conflict between Greek and Hebrew morals, butn not all at once. His ethical idealism where freedom and dependence meet, expresses itself in action in self-forgetful service - in love. His social ideal is less comprehensive than that of Jesus.

He gives a large place to goodness in the religious life and follows Jesus in this respect. There is no good ground for the allegation that he magnifies theological doctrine at the expense of ethical interests. Like Jesus he draws out the contrast between the conception of goodness as the mere observance of rules and the law of love. Those phases of his teaching in which the conception of goodness is the outflow from an inner life are prominent. Goodness for Paul is the fruiting of what is within. Instead of telling his converts what they ought to be, he begins by telling them what they are. Life in the spirit is the secret of victory in the moral struggle. The spirit of life in Christ Jesus involves a deepening of the sense of individuality; involves also an ideal which ever outstrips attainment. It is in the interest of the life of the spirit that Paul makes his insistent plea for freedom. "In the working out of the allegory of Sarah and Hagar as representatives of the two covenants, the argument itself may seem to be far-fetched and unconvincing, but that for which he is arguing is of the greatest moment, the superiority of goodness which springs from the inner life of the spirit to goodness which rises no higher than the observance of rules.

By the persistence and fervor of his exposition and defence of this superiority, he has made all the subsequent Christian centuries his debtor in the perennial struggle to resist the introduction of legalism into the Church of Him who died to redeem us from the curse of the law."(I).

It is possible that when translated out of its theological nomenclature Pauline truth has a deathless message for all men of all times. Morality is absolutely vital to his religion.

"We too have the mind of Christ, and we are never so true to the spirit of Paul as when we apply the great principles of his master and ours to the needs of our age."(2). His ethical teaching finds its originality and uniqueness partly in its range of practical application, but principally in the unfolding of an ideal which is at once the power and the pattern of a new life. "The most distinctive and pregnant idea underlying Paul's teaching is the idea of a self communication of God to man, and for him Christianity culminates in the doctrine of the indwelling of God in humanity, the might of the spirit working in human hearts and strengthening them to receive, to act, and to endure."(3). "The Christianity which Paul taught, just because it has its springs in the living Christ, is an inexhaustible fountain of life, a stream of refreshing and renewal which must expand and grow deeper and broader with the growth of man."(4). It was perfectly natural, when the profound intellectual problems that had to be faced are taken into account, that Christianity was approached from the speculative rather than from the practical side. Paul combined in a manner rarely paralleled in history speculative acumen with practical talent.

(I). Ross,D.M.:"The Faith of St. Paul", p133f.
(2)3,4. Alexander,A.B.D.:"Ethics of St. Paul", p323,353,359 resp.

C. Kingdom of God.

We have already pointed out that the gospel and the epistles are distinct types, and that the Pauline elements in the former are quite insignificant. Such a fact has been interpreted by those who think in such a fashion, by the statement that the teaching of the gospels has not been corrupted by the theology of the epistles. We are particularly concerned to know what became of the doctrine of the Kingdom of God at the hands of Paul. While it is prominent in the gospels and subordinate in the epistles, the conception by no means disappears. In some cases Paul is thinking, not of anything present, but rather of the future; of the actual experience of Christian men. The signs of the coming of the kingdom are a new spirit permeating the life, a new attitude and temper of mind, a new relation of the soul to God; righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. He could only have learnt this lesson in the school of Jesus. The central teaching of Jesus is contained in Paul's words - "for I am not ashamed of the gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek. For therein is revealed a righteousness of God from faith unto faith: as it is written, But the righteous shall live by faith."(I). For Paul the whole gospel is summed up as a revelation of the righteousness of God. The word righteousness described the deepest workings of the divine mind as it went forth in loving kindness and pity to the people of his choice. Paul the Pharisee grasped all this intensely. All that the Jews felt for Israel as a nation, Paul took over bodily and claimed for the Church of Christ. His whole life

(I). Rom.1,16 f. A.R.V.

was one long prolonged effort to convey to the world outside what Christ had done for them that loved him. The Old Testament was saturated with the conception of the righteousness of God. It was not passive, but active and energizing. It was God at work in the world. The Kingdom of God was the same, and the parallelism runs through all the stages. The greatest emphasis in both cases is on the point of origin. The language is different, although both are based upon the Old Testament. The content of the two cycles of language and of thought is essentially the same. The central and cardinal point of the Christian dispensation is the same in either case; it is the goodness and love of God, actively intervening to guide, redeem, sustain and bless his people. Paul, therefore, uses this idea in the same sense in which it had been used by Jesus. He does not express it very frequently, but several times he uses it to remind his readers of the general principles which he regards as the elements of the Christian doctrine communicated to them. In part he uses it in reference to the future heavenly state of the kingdom that is to be introduced by the second coming of Christ, that is to say, he interprets it eschatologically. At the same time he represents the possibility of the present attainment and realization of the kingdom, consisting as it did, in their present possession of salvation, and their present exercise of righteousness. The content of the following passages demonstrates that he thinks of the kingdom of God as already existing - "for the kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit"(I): "For the kingdom of God is not in word, but in power."(2). Wendt

(I). I Cor., 4,20. A.R.V. (2). Rom.,I4,I7. A.R.V.

points out that this difference in meaning in the use of the idea is more striking because its reason is not directly apparent.

"But we find the historical explanation of this peculiar Pauline usage of speech in the transformation which the idea of Jesus as to the Kingdom of God underwent, and in the way in which he employed this traditional idea, and, conversely, this Pauline usage in its turn attests that the view of the kingdom of God which we have seen to be that of Jesus, can very well be regarded as a unity in spite of the term being employed in different ways in different places."(I).

D. Doctrine of God.

Paul had inherited the legal and imperial tradition of Judaism. His conviction opened his eyes to another view of the Divine character. Now he was aware of a generous and persuasive God, a "living God". This conception involved for him a new understanding of the very nature of religion. He had discovered, not so much the solution of a problem, as the offer of a gift. He now experienced an intimacy with a living God. His theology begins with God's search for man and not in the reverse manner. It was a spiritual interpretation of life and history which now dominated his thought. His knowledge and experience of God was a mystical one. The new sense of intimacy he experienced was attained by the transforming fact of a single experience. The deity of Christ was not a Pauline doctrine: God was the transcendent source and Christ the intermediate agent. God was for Paul the nature and essence of all things. He asserts creatorship and spirituality for God. Man's essential kinship to God, and God's spiritual omnipresence and universal relation

(I). Wendt, H.H:"The Teaching of Jesus"? Vol 1, p 407f.

are foundation stones in his teaching. Redemption springs from within the Divine being, and is wholly gratuitous on God's part. Any persistence in sin on the part of men brings on them the just wrath of God. God has revealed himself to all men in some manner. God gives to man - it is man's part to accept the gift.

E. Knowledge of the Historical Jesus.

There is good ground for the contention made by so many critics that Paul tells us almost nothing of the life and person of Jesus. He does unquestionably give us the impression of the greatness of Jesus. He has a few quite occasional, almost accidental communications to his Churches. In one place he quotes the words of the Lord forbidding divorce, the right of an apostle to be supported by the community, the account of the last supper in the night when Jesus was betrayed, and a list of the witnesses for the Resurrection.(I). What has significance for Paul is simply and solely the crucified and risen Son of God. He is the scantiest of our sources for the knowledge we have of Jesus. The Jesus he preaches is the Son of God who came down from heaven to die and rise again for our propitiation - it is with the great outlines of this mighty drama that he is concerned, and everything else sinks into comparative insignificance; but only comparatively so. We are in danger, as has been pointed out, if for one moment we neglect the importance of the source of information he had in the tradition of the first disciples. The fact that his was the earliest Christian theology merely serves to show that it was a necessity in his case: as the want of an immediate knowledge for the basis of his creed impelled him to justify

(I). I Cor., 7,IO - 9,I4 - II,23ff - I5,4ff. A.R.V.

his position by means of reason. Christianity was inconceivable as a religion without a theology. Having said that, it is necessary to point out its implications in two directions. It at once establishes the reasonable inference that Paul had not seen Jesus in his earthly manifestation: had he done so he would with greater likelihood have quoted Jesus verbatim in support of his contentions, and at the same time he would in the very nature of the case have been less likely to assign to Jesus such a position of preeminence as he did. If, on the other hand, we deprive him of the knowledge of Jesus as handed on by his disciples, we at once leave the field open to the theory that Paul merely created a mythical Christ out of his previous conception of the expected Messiah, and thus made him akin to the gods of the pagan cults. There is no reasonable warrant for either of these contentions. The Tübingen school contends that Paul's knowledge of the historical Christ was small, basing such a contention on the much disputed imputation in 2 Cor.5,16. Many authors have made more or less complete compilations of the actual references in the Pauline epistles to facts in the life and teachings of Jesus. Some of these have been mentioned. It is hardly necessary to add anything further in the way of direct quotation from Paul. This aspect of the question, perhaps more than any other, is the one in which every writer sees what he wants to see and no more or less. We have the fact that Paul persecuted the Christians, and it has been reasonably stated that he must have then familiarized himself with the claims they made. It is possible also that he disputed the matter with Stephen. He had first hand contact with the leaders at Jerusalem, and spent no inconsiderable time with Peter. In addition, he had the benefit of the companionship on his

journeys with two of the future authors of the gospels. Add to this the naturally inquirying turn of his mind, and the fact that he assumes a knowledge of facts that he finds no occasion to mention in his epistles on the part of his converts, and it is safe to maintain that he knew far more than he actually tells us. Moreover, there was ample opportunity in the early days of the Church for a complete denial to be made of the material contained in the Pauline epistles if they had been open to question. No such attempt seems to have been made, and to all appearances the original disciples were unable to deny the truth of the facts Paul used in his teaching. Concerning the argument from silence, it is important to remember that there are other epistles in the New Testament which should yield us more information about the facts of the historical Jesus, but which do not.

> Machen establishes the following three important facts,
> "(i). Paul regarded himself as a disciple of Jesus of Nazareth.
> (ii). He was so regarded by the intimate friends of Jesus.
> (iii). He had abundant sources of information about Jesus' life. The natural conclusion is that Paul was a true disciple of the real Jesus."(I).

The opening verses of the fifteenth chapter of his first letter to the Corinthians successfully refutes any inference that may be drawn from the first two chapters of the letter to the Galatians to the effect that he was indifferent to tradition. What did Paul know of the life and teachings of Jesus? The details of the earthly life for Paul were transcended by the realities and activities of the risen life of Christ. The Christ whom he claims to know is the Jesus of the gospels.

(I). Machen,J.G.:"The Origin of Paul's Religion", pI4If.

F. Doctrine of the Church.

In Paul's lifetime the Church was in a perfectly fluid condition. The kingdom of God was thought of as the will of God at work in the world. The Pauline doctrine of the Church was built and developed out of that of salvation by faith. The outward and visible result of this doctrine was the appearance in the world of a society resembling in externals the mystic sects of the Hellenistic world; but only, it should be noted, in externals. The Church, for Paul, denoted the whole body of Christian people. Its religious significance was shown in the character of its people. It is the body of Christ. The conceptions of the Church and the sacrament were shared by Paul with the rest of the Christian Church, and were part of what he had received from it. The gospel was the revelation of a divine mystery, a divine purpose. Paul has learned to see everywhere traces of a divine government of the world.

As we have seen, the kingdom of God was a phrase which he employed but infrequently, and which for him stood as the name for the principles or truths of Jesus' teaching and the reign of God in the perfected society of the future. By the Church he most frequently meant an assembly of believers, a present collective society, and by the kingdom of God a society of Christians as it shall be in the coming age of Messianic blessedness.

G. The Sacraments.

Scholarship is divided over Paul's relation to the introduction of sacramentarianism into Christianity, some completely exonerating him, and others asserting that he is the first to transform Christianity from its more primitive form into a Mystery Religion. It is admitted that at an early

date Christianity became Sacramentarian. "Paul never conceives baptism strictly as rebirth or regeneration, but as a mystic death....In the mysteries the conception of regeneration was associated with baptismal rites. In these, too, regeneration is compared with dying. The initiation which guarantees regeneration is also conceived as a dying or as a participation in the death and resurrection of a mystery-Savior. That Paul should use such conceptions in connection with baptism does not, however, prove that baptism was regarded by him as identical with initiation rites in paganism."(I).

What does seem evident is that he did not refuse to use these terms to win the Gentiles to Christianity, as they undoubtedly had value. The evidence for sacramentalism is inconclusive. His references to the rites are scanty; there is no priesthood in existence, and he emphasizes his evangelical commission rather than the right to baptize. When we consider his utterances concerning the sacraments, we must take into consideration the fact that he was a mystic, and that these statements grew out of his experiential theology.

"The chief obstacle to interpreting Paul as the first Christian sacramentarian lies in the confessedly central place of faith-mysticism in Paul's own life and teaching: this was neither induced by, nor dependent on, sacramental operations. In his gospel, which is 'the power of God to salvation to every believer', salvation comes only and always through faith, and accompanied by the spirit. The faith mysticism stands in irreconcilable antithesis to a union vouchsafed through physico-spiritual acts....Paul accepted the rites which he found in existence in the Church at his conversion, but he left nothing in Christianity the same as he found it."(2).

(I). Angus, S.: "The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World", p 197. (2). Ibid., p 202.

The only account we have of the Lord's Supper is in the first letter to the Corinthians. There are other references in the first three gospels, of which that in Luke bears the closest resemblance to the Pauline description. It is necessary to recognize that even this mention is only called forth by the disorders in the Church at Corinth. Commenting on this, Bandas truly goes on to say - "Had no such occasion existed, the epistles of St. Paul might have been altogether silent about the Eucharist, and then the critics would certainly hasten to assure us that St. Paul knew nothing about it."(I).

> Ernest Scott gives us the following passage on the Pauline contribution - "It is important to remember that Paul did not begin the Gentile mission, as has often been assumed. Before he appeared on the scene it had been inaugurated, and seems to have made considerable progress. All the time that he was carrying on his great work there were other missionaries, hardly less zealous and successful, who were devoting themselves, as he had done, to the conversion of the Gentiles. It may be confidently affirmed that even without Paul the Gentile mission would have gone forward. That Christianity became a universal religion was no historical accident, due to the effort of one extraordinary man. The impulse to the mission lay in the character of the gospel itself. It was a universal message, and was bound in course of time to force its way through all barriers and make its appeal to the world at large. Nor can we hold Paul responsible for the altered form in which the gospel was henceforth proclaimed. It was customary, a generation ago, to speak of him as the second founder, or as some preferred to call him, the perverter of Christianity. This view has left its mark on much of the popular thinking of the present day. Paul, we are told, took the religion of Jesus, of which he had only a superficial knowledge, and wrested it from its original character- recasting it in moulds of Hellenistic thought which were quite foreign to it. But this process of remodelling, whether it be legitimate or not, had already begun, and was inevitable. It was brought about, not by the singularities of any one thinker, but by the large influences which were at work in the whole life of the time. In the Hellenistic atmosphere the new religion could not but become Hellenised. "(2).

(I). "The Master Idea of St. Paul's Epistles", p 201.
(2). "The Gospel and its Tributaries", 1930, pp22-23.

"It was of priceless value to Christianity that the man who labored most earnestly to reinterpret it was also he who had the truest insight into its message. If it was safely carried over into the new world, and mastered the forces which at one time threatened to engulf it, this was mainly the achievement of Paul". (I).

(I). Scott,E.F.:"The Gospel and its Tributaries", 1930, p154-5.

8. Jesus and Paul.

We are now ready to institute some sort of a comparison between the experience and teachings of Jesus and Paul, and to endeavor to see where they argeed and where they differed from each other on questions of major importance. This will necessitate taking into consideration all that has been alreay written, and for purposes of illustration and emphasis recapitulating it in part. Some English writers have commented favorably upon the German trait of presenting both sides of the question impartially. For this reason conflicting views will be shown where they exist as symptomatic of the diversity of opinion which prevails. In the light of these divergences and agreements, it will remain to close with a consideration as to who the founder of Christianity really was; which will in turn be seen to depend in no small measure upon the angle of approach to the question.

The subject of dispute is the most important question that can be raised from the point of view of the history of our religion; the whole problem of the origin of historical Christianity is summed up in it. The question of its dogmatic importance is almost on a par with that of the historical consideration. The contrast raises the question as to the place and right of these constructions in our Christian religion, and the place and right of speculative constructions in general. In the historical problem there is striking agreement combined with a no less striking differerence. In many things Paul is substantially at one with Jesus - in others he is independent, following paths which Jesus never trod.

Externally there are striking contrasts in character and aims; in the former these are sufficiently strong to warrant

in the opinion of some critics, the conclusion at which Wrede arrived, namely, that "in comparison with Jesus, Paul is essentially a new phenomenon."(I). The more divergent their characters seem, the more one is impressed by the reappearance in Paul's teaching of the essential note of the gospel message.

In the final analysis the divergences are not so numerous as to preclude continuity and a genuine transmission of the thought of Jesus by Paul. They are neither so numerous nor so serious as is generally alleged. Paul reproduces in a very remarkable way the mind of Christ. We have to recognize the influence of a force from without, namely, the work of the Divine Spirit - God in action in the affairs and thoughts of men - and that after all is the indefeasible basis of religion.

A. Divergences.

1. In Experience.

It is generally agreed that Paul knew something of the teachings of Jesus. The relation between them is conceived to be one of warm personal friendship. The vision and conversion of Paul are psychologically inconceivable except upon the supposition that he had been actually and vividly impressed by the personality of Jesus. He was also influenced by the faith of the first disciples. We must realize the difference between the two personalities as produced by their respective positions, the conditions in which they lived, their religious temperaments, education, modes of thought and expression, conduct of life and receptivity. The thought and expression of Jesus was concrete, popular, plastic, as compared with the abstract terms constantly used by Paul. We cannot expect that the gospel of Jesus should retain the original form in passing through the mind of the

(I). Wrede, P.: "Paul", p 165.

apostle. Upon the whole the personality of Jesus impresses us as less Jewish than that of Paul, but Paul's outlook upon the world is from the outset far more universal in its general outlines. Paul's doctrine was propounded in accordance with a philosophy of history. He belonged to the Rabbinical school and Jesus did not. Paul as the first theologian uses the method of the scribes and Rabbis and employs polemical and apologetic purposes. He is the founder of the Logos Christology and therefore of ecclesiastical dogma. His attitude toward Judaism is different from that of Jesus. Jesus promulgated no theology: the new world-wide religion stood in need of a theology such as Paul possessed. Paul explained the theoretical principles upon which the type of life created by Jesus was based. The sayings of Jesus are original conceptions expressing in different ways the divisions which separated him from the prevailing pietism, and though varied in tone and wealth of expression they are characterized by uniformity of sentiment. Paul, on the other hand, gives us a sharply defined formula. Though his formula is not entirely happy owing to divergency, his religious theory coincides with that of Jesus in its essential points.

Paul must have been convinced by the narratives of the first disciples, or by personal impression, that Jesus was entirely devoted to the task, not merely of preaching the love of God, but of acting as its incarnation in his every word and deed, and of preaching it so attractively that sinners were able to take courage in view of that love. Paul's picture of the apocalyptic Messiah was corrected in the most important details by the general impression of Jesus as proclaiming, fulfilling, and performing the divine intentions of love.

Here we observe the profound and decisive influence of Jesus upon Paul.

As contrasted with Jesus Paul is a typical Christian by conversion, which divided his life into two distinct parts. There was a difference also between them as to the question of redemption and the time of its coming. The type of Christianity represented by Paul is one of conversion and redemption.

> "There is one general difference between the religion of Paul and the type of religious life which Jesus originally created; to the apostle Jesus is not merely a mediator, guide and example, but he is also the object of religious veneration. Paul certainly utters the cry of 'Abba' together with Jesus, but he also calls upon the name of Christ. He trusts God's love and grace, but the strength which is mighty in his weakness is the life of Christ in his mortal frame. With Jesus he looks to a glorious future when he will see God face to face, but he also longs to see Christ 'manifested', and to 'be ever with Christ'. Hence the faith in Christ held by the primitive Church and by Paul was something new in comparison with the preaching of Jesus: it was a new type of religion. Here we touch the real problem for the Church, the 'question of destiny': can the Church for all time maintain this type of Christianity? In comparison with this question, other points of difference in doctrine, in religious attitude, and in character are of small account, and are likely rather to enrich our religious vitality than to raise any problem in our path. The theory, however, that Paul's faith was not connected by any living tie with the historical figure of Jesus, and that the coincidence of the methods employed by Paul and Jesus for the solution in practice of the problems of life was merely fortuitous is henceforward little likely to disturb theology."(I).

We are struck by the directness, the perfect simplicity, the natural consistency of our Lord's whole character and teaching when contrasted with the dialectic and complex thought of Paul. With Jesus there is no system, no definite theology or Christology. Paul's doctrines express the profoundest and noblest truth; he could not, however, shake himself free from his old modes of thought and expression. The following may be taken

---

(I). Weiss,J.:"Paul and Jesus", pI30f.

as typical of the manner of expressing the contrast between them by one of the contributors to the controversy.

> "On the one hand we have a mythological drama developing according to a fixed Divine plan and at a definite point in time,wherein Christ plays his appointed part and mankind, represented as forming all alike one multitude of lost and helpless souls, passes on, willingly or unwillingly to meet its fore-ordained doom of condemnation or grace; and yet a drama realized in personal experience wherein the action of the hero and the pervading plot are most deeply felt, and are the passionate expression of personal conviction - this is Paul. On the other hand, we have a human soul, absolutely sure of God, living a life which was the simple expression of the inward self, full of loving self-sacrifice, victorious in both conflict and defeat, finding indeed in defeat the truest victory, ever seeking and ever finding the will of God, always fulfilling, though not always comprehending that will - this is Jesus."(I).

Paul sets forth his own soul - the necessary result being a new doctrine answering to his personality. There is, despite the difference, a bond of union. He was conscious of dependence upon the personality of Jesus. Paul is separated from Jesus in time and also in the fact that the Cross and the Resurrection stand between them.

We can detect two distinctions of experience which in part serve to account for the wide divergences,

a, Jesus was dependent on the will of God in his religion and taught with authority - Paul was utterly dependent on Jesus and with rare exceptions was a man under authority.

b, Jesus never knew the sense of guilt nor of sin - Paul knew sin and applied to its solution the experience of being saved through Jesus Christ.

ii. Teachings and the Law.

As for the teachings it would be hard to point out any essential feature in the conception of sin in which Paul differs from, or goes beyond his Master. Neither can it be maintained

(I). Meyer,A.:"Jesus or Paul?", 83.

that Jesus took a lighter view than Paul of the consequences of sin. The differences are sufficiently explained by the different circumstances of his life: at the same time there is an inward harmony which still waits for explanation. The differences in respect to the law were almost wholly differences in tone. The criticism of Jesus was directed against the people who represented the law - that of Paul against the system. There is a subtle and significant harmony between them in respect to the principle which they apply to the criticism of the law.

It should be said in defence of Paul that both his teaching and that of Jesus exhibit an ethical purpose: they both lay the emphasis on character, and the great words of Christ are also the great words of Paul.

"Nevertheless, although Paul has in mind here the human quality of loyalty or trustworthiness, there is nothing more common in his letters than the collocation of faith and love. It is in line with the teaching of Jesus that Paul thus summarizes the Christian religion towards God and man; faith (rather than love) towards God, carrying with it love towards other Christians. The combination of the two is one of his own creations."(I).

iii. Christology and Redemption.

Between Jesus and Paul there stands three things which both account for and justify the additional features in the Pauline teaching. These are the death and resurrection of Jesus, and the experience of Paul. In assigning to Jesus an absolute significance among men, and to his death a special significance in connection with sin and salvation, he is in harmony with the

---

(I). Moffatt,J.:"Love in the New Testament", pI7I.

total impression left by the Synoptic gospels, and not out of harmony with the mind of Jesus so far as it may be ascertained from the same sources. Paul was not a schoolman born out of due time, nor a systematic theologian. His letters are situational letters, as we have already pointed out. His long years of missionary preaching cannot be considered as primarily theological. Faith for Paul was immeasurably more than belief in a dogma.

Paul gives us a fully elaborated doctrine of redemption, of which Jesus can scarcely be said to know anything at all. Jesus could forgive on the royal ground that is kind to the unthankful and the heathen; Paul had to insert the element of vicarious sacrifice. Paul displays pessimism about the natural man as contrasted with the optimism of Jesus. Jesus did not attach to his death the same significance as did Paul. The Pauline doctrines of redemption and the spirit have no correspondences with the teaching of Jesus. Christology was vital to Paul's doctrine. It is his sense of standing in a vital relation with this exalted Christ that is the mainspring of his piety. For him the one condition of salvation is faith in the Redeemer and His Redemption. His gospel was to a considerable extent the result of reflection and speculation. While Jesus was no theologian, Paul, on the other hand, was an apologist and constructive thinker. His theology was a product of the transformation - not its cause. This was true both of his Christology and doctrine of redemption. Nevertheless, the religion of the epistles is still vital and creative. We find here that faith and hope and love have come to direct expression.

B. Correspondences.

These are more radical and far-reaching than the former

and underlie them for the most part. While only a minor consideration, they were both largely dominated by the apocalyptic outlook. They were substantially one in their conception of God, which is a fundamental to every religion. Paul reproduces the essential notes of Jesus' piety - in faith and hope and love they are one. Trust in the grace of God is for both the secret of grace and the wellspring of power. The agreement of Paul with Jesus in respect to the fundamental matters of religion is too general and too close to be explained on any other hypothesis than that of dependence. Both wage war with sin, and believe in and promise a delieverance from sin. It was the spirit of Jesus that came over Paul, and in so far he rightly regarded Jesus as his Lord, and rightly called himself an apostle of Jesus. Paul so received Jesus into himself, and reproduced him after his own fashion in a manner so profound and lofty and spiritual, that Christianity and the cause of Jesus were thereby promoted in many respects.

i Conception of God.

While no distinction can be suggested between the respective conceptions of God in relation to His character or His attributes, there is specific concurrence in the emphasis laid by Paul, as by Jesus, upon the Fatherhood of God, and also on the deductions drawn from it. God the Father and One in whom the manifestation of his Fatherhood is a pattern for His children - this was a profound conception and a new one, and it is common to Jesus and to Paul. The following passages are sometimes taken to indicate that Paul does refer to the Kingdom of God with the same connotation as Jesus. Speaking of the works of the flesh he goes on to say "of which I forewarn you even as I did forewarn you, that they who practise such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." (Gal,5,2I).

Speaking of the Father he describes Him as follows - "who delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of His love."(I). He characterized his conduct toward them as being in part "to the end that ye should walk worthily of God, who called you into His own kingdom and glory."(2). The references are not more frequent because for Paul Christ takes the place of the kingdom; is,in fact, the equivalent of the kingdom in the teaching of Jesus. Christ is Paul's synonym for the highest and good.

ii. Ethics.

In respect to their dominant ethical conceptions and their application, it is what is original in Jesus that becomes normative in Paul. There is a basicharmony in their conceptions of love and its importance, and in the main a wonderful ethical harmony. In the life and death of Jesus, Paul saw the supreme manifestation of the mighty love of God toward sinful men, and in the ideal life of a Christian the human response thereto manifested in love to God and love to men. In both particulars he seized what was essential and creative in the revelation of Jesus. Alike in Jesus and Paul, this manner of life and relation to other men, rested on, and sprang out of, a conviction concerning God and His will to forgive and save, a purpose which was the expression of his disposition of love towards mankind.

C. Who was the Founder of Christianity?

Paul has been charged with heavily encumbering the cause of Christianity by his pecuilar personality with its tendency to recondite Gnostic speculation and Rabbinical argument. How far was Paul the founder of Christianity? This is one of the major issues of the problem. Meyer gives his answer as follows -

---

(I). Col.I,I3. (2). I Thess. 2,I2, A.R.V.

"If by Christianity we understand faith in Christ as the Heavenly Son of God, then such Christianity was founded by Paul and not by our Lord."(I).

We have seen that we are far from being justified in speaking without qualification of Paul as the founder of Christianity, as the conceptions here employed were neither all created by Paul, nor was he the first to apply all of them to Jesus of Nazareth. Our religion in its essence is derived from Jesus. The gospels give us the earthly Jesus and he has played his part in Christendom side by side with the Pauline Christ. Paul performed for us the service of a liberator when he released us from bondage to those accidental limitations of the personality of Jesus which placed him and held him fast under the yoke of the law.

The Christian movement was due to a two-fold belief in Jesus' Messiahship and Resurrection. Jesus felt that his cause would continue. It is doubtful, however, as to whether he thought of returning to conclude it. He was therefore the founder of the Messianic movement carried on by his disciples in only a limited sense. He was the conscious and deliberate founder in the sense that he expected his followers to carry on the work after him. The movement was older than Paul, and underwent a further transformation at his hands. Only with the separation of Christianity from Judaism could the idea of a Christian Church in a strict sense arise. When Christianity broke from Judaism and became an independent movement, the conditions existed in which the idea of a specifically Christian Church could grow up, and it is no accident that it appears first in the Pauline epistles, and that it owed its development to him. In this sense Paul, and not

---

(I). Meyer,A.:"Jesus or Paul?", pI22.

Jesus, was the founder of the Church. Without Jesus it would not have been - in his name and upon his faith it was built.

Paul and the historic Church are one in their contention that man must be made over again if he is not to perish eternally - this can only be done through the Divine power manifested through Jesus Christ. Paul's conception of Christianity was due to his despair of his inability to keep the law, the revelation of Christ as a spiritual being freed from evil and the flesh, his contacts with Hellenic life and thought, and the cataclysmic character of his conversion. Though to Paul is due the larger and perhaps controlling part of the Christianity of all the centuries since his day, there is another element which ultimately comes from Christ. So far as there is anything distinctive in Christian piety, in the Christian's attitude toward God and communion with him, it is due to Jesus. Also in his attitude toward his fellow-men Jesus left a permanent impression. Jesus was the founder of the principle of love and service. Without Jesus Christianity and the Christian Church certainly would not have been. It was founded in his name and it draws its faith from him, for that which is of greatest worth in it, and that which chiefly accounts for its hold upon the modern world, was given by him.

Paul was the founder of Christianity if by that we mean or understand belief in dogmas as to the person of Christ and his propitiating death. According to Weinel the great mission of Christianity was mainly Paul's work. In Paul, as in Jesus, one realizes that the living core and center of the whole religion is joy in the Divine Sonship. In both there is an ethical religion of redemption which issued from the ethical religion of Judaism - in Jesus through an inner spiritualizing process -

in Paul by a sudden conversion. "It was an historic necessity that the gospel of Jesus should be turned into a Church, and it was Paul who took the first steps and who had to take them, to make of this necessity an actual fact."(I). Christianity as Paul knew it was the Way characterized by these two observances of baptism and the Lord's Supper, symbolizing respectively forgiveness for the sake of the Risen Redeemer and new life in his spirit.

Other factors which must be taken into consideration are that the ministry of Jesus was brief as contrasted with that of Paul - that Paul has left us many genuine letters while the sayings of Jesus were recorded long years after his death. The latter, however, as has been shown already, bear the stamp of originality. "Without Paul Christianity might have been different - without Jesus it would have been impossible."(2). He is not the real founder of Christianity according to this author, but the faith in Christ would have conquered the world without him.

> "Christianity never has been nor can be what is usually called Paulinism, for all the attractive features of the system; and even though at times the teaching of Paul has been studied to the exclusion of most of the rest of the New Testament, its influence in the many centuries of the Church's life has been but intermittent. But at no time has it been possible to ignore Jesus, even by those who deny him the obedience which his Church demands and refuse to see in him the Savior of the world. Christianity stands or falls with Jesus. It is profoundly untrue to say that Paul made Jesus, or even gave him an importance he would not otherwise have had. It is a literal fact that Jesus made Paul and the greatness of the disciple is one of the chief miracles wrought by the Master."(3).

(1). Weinel,H.:"Paul, the Man and His Work", p216.
(2). Foakes-Jackson,F.J.:"Paul".
(3). Ibid., p281.

> "In face of the intense personal devotion of Saint Paul to our Lord, it has become unintelligible to speak of the apostle as if he was the founder of Christianity. How indeed, can we speak of him, with Wrede, in another of the series of popular books which are at this moment pouring from the press in Germany, as the second founder of Christianity, or proclaim that Saint Paul, although not better, was greater than his Master? But Saint Paul's sole ambition is to gain Christ and be found of him; he is calm and secure when he can say that he has the mind of Christ; he only asserts himself when he has no command from the Lord, he bids his followers to imitate his example, but he adds in the same breath, 'as he also imitated Christ', and we have seen how throughout his epistles he too goes as it were back to Christ, he speaks of his own teaching everywhere in every Church, but that teaching was to be a resemblance of his ways which were in Christ."(I).

Strachan raises the following questions in an endeavor to find a solution of this modern theological question concerning "Jesus or Paul". "Did Paul succeed in imposing upon Christianity a conception of the person of Christ, which originated with himself and is the product of his own thought? Did he merely reflect upon the facts of his own subjective experience,aided by Pharisaic conceptions of the Messiah?"(2). If this question be answered in the affirmative, he goes on to add, then Paul and not Jesus is the founder of Christianity; but such a conclusion is entirely at variance with the consciousness and claims of Paul himself, and completely inconsistent with his attitude of obedience and adoration towards Jesus.

"The faith of the great genius is not something that has come to him in an impersonal way but he feels that he personally has been gripped by it. It is that type of religious experience that Paul shared and described in the words -'Not that I have already obtained, or am already made perfect: but I press on, if so be that I may lay hold on that for which also I was laid hold on by Christ Jesus."(3).

(I). Knowling,R.J.:"The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ",p457.
(2). Strachan,R.H.:"The Individuality of St. Paul", p64.
(3). Bundy,W.E.:"Religion of Jesus", p98.

Paul did not create the Christian faith in Jesus as a religious object. This was present from the first in the thought of the early disciples. The answer to the question as to who founded Christianity depends, as we have pointed out, on our understanding of Christianity."

> "If by Christianity we mean Jesus' faith in God as Father and in his Kingdom and its coming, such as he preached in his Sermon on the Mount and in his parables, then Jesus was the founder of Christianity. But if by Christianity we mean an organized and official religion, a new faith that involved a definite break with the religion of Israel, competing with other religions of the first three centuries for supremacy in the Roman world,then Paul was the founder of Christianity. The founding of Christianity in the historical forms in which it has appeared is thework of Paul and other early Christians as the result of their Easter experiences."(I).
>
> "In its historical forms as a new faith, as a system of thought, as an organized religion, Christianity bears the marks of Paul rather than those of Jesus."(2).

(I). Bundy,W.E.:"Religion of Jesus", p294f.
(2). Ibid., p295.

Summary.

In all essential respects, therefore, we may continue to regard Jesus as the founder of Christianity. We have seen that it is not apparent that he was personally responsible for the founding of an organization, due to the limitations of time and space. He supplied the new movement with all that was essential for its future development.

It further appears that as a necessary consequence of his death and the belief of his disciples in his resurrection they began to proclaim their faith in him to all who would listen, and carried their message far and wide, so that Churches were established as far as Rome. The growth and organization, such as it was, was unconscious, and perfectly natural.

Paul inherited this background from the primitive community. His essential contribution lay in the intellectual impetus he gave the new faith, so that he was able to interpret it and make it acceptable to the Hellenic world. But he was not a pure Hellenist. It remained for later workers to completely Hellenize the gospel and to develop an ecclesiastical hierarchy. Paul endeavored to think through the latent implications for the world in the life and death and resurrection of Jesus. While his expression of these truths takes a primary place in the literature which has come down to us, there is no evidence to warrant the deduction that his message was in any sense new or contradicted that of his fellow-workers. They recognized and accepted him as a collaborator. There is no evidence that he founded an organization such as was later to develop into the Church of Rome. He did expand the appeal of the gospel, and so can be regarded as the Church's greatest missionary, and by the intensity and sincerity of his life as the greatest Christian.

It is not demonstrated that he deified Jesus, although he unquestionably exalted him. He did not make of Christianity a pagan cult comparable to the Mystery Religions. He did use the ideas that were current for purposes of illustration. He did believe in an historical Jesus. There are both primary and secondary, temporary and permanent elements in the Pauline contribution. In many essentials Jesus and Paul are at one. Of necessity Paul differed from Jesus because the former stood in an objective relation to the Cross, and was compelled, as were all the other Christians, to look at the life of Jesus in a way that Jesus himself could not have done. Their faith was certainly grounded in the belief in the exaltedness of Jesus' life and teachings, and in the reality of his death and resurrection. There is nothing exclusively Pauline in this connection. The literature which developed expressed the two elements that were complementary - the religion of Jesus and the religion about Jesus. Both were necessary as expressions of the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith. But we cannot lay the responsibility for this upon Paul alone. For him it was enough to know "that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself."(I).

And finally, as Ernest Scott has said "It is the fate of all controversy that to a later age it appears a fighting about shadows. The disputants, sharing in the opinions of their time, are unconsciously in agreement, and their differences, to themselves so important, are hardly discernible in the larger perspective."[2] Such may be the verdict of history about this particular controversy.

(I). 2 Cor.5,I9. A.R.V.
(2). "The Gospel and its Tributaries",I930. p206.

Bibliography.

Note: Books marked ** have been read twice; those marked * have been read once; all others in part or by chapters as indicated.

Alexander,A.B.D., The Ethics of St. Paul.Glasgow: J.Maclenose & Sons, 1910.

Angus,S., The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World. N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons., 1929.

ee------ The Mystery Religions and Christianity. N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons., 1925.

*------- The Environment of Early Christianity.N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons., 1915.

Bacon,B.W., The Story of St. Paul. Boston & N.Y.: Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1904.

---------- Christianity Old and New. Newhaven, Yale University Press, 1914.

---------- The Apostolic Message. N.Y.: The Century Co., 1925.

---------- The Story of Jesus and the Beginnings of the Church. N.Y.: The Century Co., 1927.

---------- Jesus and Paul. N.Y.: Macmillan & Co., 1921.

Bandas,R.G., The Master Idea of St. Paul's Epistles or the Redemption.St. Paul, Minnesota., E.M.Lokmann, 1925.

Bartlet,J.V., "Life and Work of Paul". Abingdon Bible Commentary. N.Y.: Abingdon Press, 1929, p 951-945.

Baur,F.C., Paul. Translated by A.Menzies. London: Williams & Norgate, Vol I., 1875.

--------- Paul. Translated by A.Menzies. London: Williams & Norgate, Vol II., 1875.

Berguer,G., Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus. Translated by E.S. & V.W. Brooks. N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1925.

Bousset,W., Jesus. Translated by J.P.Trevelyan. N.Y.: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1906.

*Bratton,F.G., "Toward the Understanding of Paul." Christian Century. Oct. 9, 1929.

Briggs, C.A., New Light on the Life of Jesus.N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1904.

Bruce,A.B., St. Paul's Conception of Christianity. N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1894.

Bulcock,H., The Passing and the Permanent in St. Paul. London: Macmillan & Co., 1926.

*Bundy,W.E., Our Recovery of Jesus. Indianopolis, Bobs Merrill Co., 1929.

*---------- The Religion of Jesus. Indianopolis, Bobs Merrill Co., 1928.

*Case,S.J., Jesus - A New Biography. Illinois, University Chicago Press, 1927.

--------- Studies in Early Christianity. N.Y.: Century Co., 1928.

--------- The Evolution of Early Christianity. Illinois, University Chicago Press, 1920.

--------- "The Life of Jesus". in G.B.Smith (ed.), Religious Thought in the Last Quarter Century. Chicago: University Chicago Press, 1927, p 26-45.

Charles,R.H., A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life. London: Adam & Chas. Black, 1913.

Clemen, C., Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources. Translated by R.G.Nisbet. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1912.

Cohu, J.R., St. Paul in the Light of Modern Research. London: Edward Arnold, 1911.

Cone, O., Paul, the Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher. N.Y.: Macmillan Co., 1898.

**Deismann,A., The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul.N.Y.: Doran, 1923. Translated by W.E.Wilson.

---------- Paul. Translated by W.E.Wilson. N.Y.: Geo.H.Doran Co., 1926.

Dobschütz,E. von., Christian Life in the Primitive Church. Translated by G.Brenner. N.Y.: G.P.Putnam's Sons., 1904.

---------- The Apostolic Age.Translated by F.L.Pogson, London: Phillip Green, 1909.

Dodd, C.H., The Meaning of St. Paul for Today. N.Y.: Geo.H. Doran & Co., 1920.

Drummond,R.J., The Relation of the Apostolic Teaching to the Teaching of Jesus. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1900.

DuBose, W.P., The Gospel According to St. Paul. N.Y.: Longman's, Green & Co., 1907.

Findlay,G., "Paul". Hasting's Bible Dictionary. N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1923. Vol III, p 696-751.

Foakes-Jackson, F.J., The Life of St. Paul. N.Y.: Boni & Liveright, 1926.

---------- The Rise of Gentile Christianity. N.Y.: Geo. H. Doran Co., 1927.

Forrest, D.W., The Christ of History and Experience. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1897.

Gardner,P., A Historic View of the New Testament. London: Adam & Chas. Black, 1904.

---------- The Religious Experience of St. Paul. N.Y.: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1911.

Glover, T.R., Paul of Tarsus. N.Y.: Geo.H. Doran Co., 1925.

Griffith,G.O., St. Paul's Life of Christ. Geo.H.Doran Co.

Harnack,A., The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries. Translated by James Moffatt. Vol I. N.Y.: G.P.Putnam's Sons, 1908.

---------- History of Dogma. Translated by Neil Buchanan. Vol I. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1899.

---------- What is Christianity? Translated by T.B. Saunders. N.Y.: G.P.Putnam's Sons, 1901.

Headlam,A.C., St. Paul and Christianity. N.Y. : Longman's Green & Co., 1913.

Henry, F.A., Jesus and the Christian Religion. N.Y.: G.P.Putnam's Sons, 1916.

Kennedy,H.A.A., St. Paul and the Mystery Religions. N.Y.: Hodder & Stoughton, 1913.

---------- St. Paul's Conception of the Last Things. N.Y.: A.C.Armstrong, 1904.

Kent,C.F., The Life and Teachings of Jesus. N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1913.

--------- The Work and Teachings of the Apostles. N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1916. p 185-190.

Knowling, R.J., The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ. N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1905.

---------- The Witness of the Epistles. London: Longman's Green & Co., 1892.

Lake,K., The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul. London: Rivington's 1911.

------- and Foakes-Jackson,F.J., The Beginnings of Christianity. Vol I. London: Macmillan & Co., 1920.

Loisy,A., The Gospel and the Church.Translated by C. Home. N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1904.

Loofs,F., What is the Truth About Jesus Christ? N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1913.

Machen, J.G., The Origin of Paul's Religion. N.Y.: Macmillan Co., 1921.

McGiffert,A.C., A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age. N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1897.

*---------- "Was Jesus or Paul the Founder of Christianity?" American Journal Theology. Chicago: University Chicago Press, 1909. Vol 13, No. 1. Jan., p 1-20.

McNeile,A.H., New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's. N.Y.: Macmillan Co., 1923.

*Meyer,A., Jesus or Paul? Translated by J.R.Wilkinson. London & N.Y.: Harper Bros., 1909.

Moffatt,J., Love in the New Testament.N.Y.: Richard R. Smith,1930.

*---------- Paul and Paulinism.Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1910.

Montefiore,C.G., Some Elements of the Religious Teaching of Jesus. London: Macmillan & Co., 1910.

Moore,G.F., History of Religions.N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons,1913.

Morgan,W., The Religion and Theology of Paul. Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1917.

Peabody,F.G., The Apostle Paul and the Modern World. N.Y.: The Macmillan Co., 1925.

Pfleiderer,O., Primitive Christianity.Translated by W. Montgomery. Vol I. N.Y.: G.P.Putnam's Sons, 1906.

---------- The Influence of the Apostle Paul on the Development of Christianity. Translated by J.F.Smith. N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1885.

Renan,E., St.Paul. Translated by Ingersoll Lockwood. N.Y.: G.W.Carleton, 1869.

*Robinson,B.W., The Life of Paul.Chicago: University Chicago Press, 1928.

Ropes, J.H., The Apostolic Age.N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons,1906.

Ross,D.M., The Faith of St, Paul. London: Jas. Clarke & Co.

---------- The Spiritual Genius of St. Paul. N.Y.: Geo.H. Doran Co.

Sabatier,A., The Apostle Paul. N.Y.: James Pott & Co., 1891.

Sanday,W., "St. Paul's Equivalent for the Kingdom of Heaven." Journal Theological Studies. July, 1900.

*Schweitzer,A., Quest of the Historical Jesus. Translated by W. Montgomery. London: Adam & Chas. Black, 1911.

*---------- Paul and His Interpreters. Translated by W. Montgomery. London: Adam & Chas. Black, 1912.

*Scott,C.A.A., "Jesus and Paul", in Essays on Some Biblical Questions. H.B.Swete (ed.). London: Macmillan,1909, p 529-577.

----------The History of Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge.N.Y.: Harcourt Brace & Co., 1929, p557-590.

*---------- Christianity According to St. Paul.Cambridge: University Press, 1927.

Scott,E.F., The Gospel and its Tributaries.Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1928.

--------- The First Age of Christianity.N.Y.: Macmillan Co., 1926.

Somerville,D., St. Paul's Conception of Christ.Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1897.

Strachan,R.H., The Individuality of St. Paul.London: Jas. Clarke & Co., 1916.

Stevens,G.B., The Pauline Theology. N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1892.

---------- The Theology of the New Testament. N.Y.: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1900.

*Warschauer,J., Jesus: Seven Questions. Boston: The Pilgrim Press, 1928.

Weinel,H., St. Paul, The Man and His Work. Translated by G.A. Beinemann. N.Y.: G.P.Putnam's Sons, 1906.

*Weiss,J., Paul and Jesus. Translated by H.J.Chaytor. London & N.Y.: Harper Bros., 1909.

*--------- Christ - The Beginnings of Dogma. Translated by V.D. Davis. Boston: American Unitarian Association, 1911.

Weizsacker, Carl von., The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church.Translated by Jas. Millar. Vol I. N.Y.: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1894.

Wendt,H.H., The Teaching of Jesus.Translated by J. Wilson. Vol I. Edinburgh: T.& T. Clark, 1892.

---------- The Teaching of Jesus.Translated by J. Wilson. Vol 2. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1892.

Wernle,P., The Beginnings of Christianity.Translated by G.A. Beinemann. N.Y.: G.P.Putnam's Sons, 1903. Vol I.

Wernle,P., The Beginnings of Christianity. Translated by G.A. Beinemann. N.Y.: G.P.Putnam's Sons. 1904. Vol 2.

*-------- The Sources of Our Knowledge of the Life of Jesus. Translated by E.Lummis. London: Phillip Green, 1907.

*Willoughby,H.R., "The Study of Early Christianity," in G.B. Smith (ed.), Religious Thought in the Last Quarter Century. University Chicago Press, Illinois, 1927. p40-49.

Wood,C.T., The Life,Letters,and Religion of St. Paul. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1925.

*Wrede,W., Paul. Translated by E. Lummis. London: Phillip Green, 1907.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
1 1719 02573 6473